

# THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

---

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1902.

---

## I.

### THE SOCIAL ORDER.

BY REV. SAMUEL Z. BEAM, D.D.

The primary and fundamental form of society rests in the constitution of the family. The social organism may therefore be said to have grown, by a process of evolution, out of this original or primitive source. Man is the crown and glory of the natural world; and can never understand his own nature, only as he contemplates it in union with the universal life of which he forms an integral part, and of which he constitutes the highest development.

By this development is not meant that form of evolution which represents man as simply the natural product and fruit of any lower order of life, but rather as the highest expression of the creative process towards which it tended from the beginning.

Genesis and geology, we believe, unite in the testimony that each new order of life, in the creative process, is built upon and glorifies that which is in the stratum next below it. And the life of man, while allied to the life of nature, as an integral part of the whole, is nevertheless a new and higher order of being. His relation to nature is inward and vital, and the material world finds its mouthpiece and prophet in the mystery of his personality. He is the organ through

which it speaks, and through which its harmonies are, or ought to be, sounded out in the praise and adoration of the creator of both.

For this reason he is more than nature. Physically and vitally, indeed, he is a part of the grand organism of universal nature; but, intellectually and spiritually, he transcends our highest possible conception of the natural world, as belonging to a wholly different and higher order of being.

Reason and freedom in their union constitute the mystery of personality, and personality is the spiritual bond of union between the creation and its creator. And, as nature reaches its end and completion in man, its moral purpose and aim must find their intelligent exponent in the life and history of man. In this way, through the intelligence and will of man, the inmost sense of the natural world is interpreted and revealed.

But now, this revelation of nature through man can never be truly realized, only as the moral and spiritual life of man rises into harmonious communion with God, who is the spring and source of all life. For man belongs to the supernatural order of existence as well as to the natural, and forms the medium of communication between nature and the supernatural. Nature and the supernatural thus joined together constitute the one universal system of God. And therefore neither nature nor man can attain the end of creation independently of the other, or of their dependent relation to God.

Again, man can only fulfill the aim of his own existence as he develops morally in relation to his fellow men. Though made up of an innumerable multitude of single individuals, humanity is still an organism, embracing all in the bond of a common life, holding in the constitution of the family, and developing in the form of the social organism.

The family originates in the union of man and wife, where each loses identity in the other, and the two become one. This union is not merely natural but moral, requiring each to sacrifice self in the interest and for the happiness of the

other. Here is the initiatory step, or the first beginning, of the social organism.

The social organism therefore originates in a union of life, and is not a mere civil contract or agreement. It started in the first pair, the history of whose divine origin proves them to be of one blood. And as their posterity multiplied they spread abroad to people the earth. All mankind are thus allied by the ties of consanguinity, and constitute the human family, or brotherhood.

If our race had maintained itself in its normal state, the evils now afflicting mankind would not be felt. But this normal condition was unhappily disturbed by the entrance of sin into the life of man. And sin became the root of subsequent evils. This is the disturbing and disintegrating force which creates strife and discord in our social life. And until this force is met and overcome all attempts at reform in our social organism must be futile. The social system is, by its very nature, but the aggregate of family life; and so long as the family is tainted with the elements of disintegration and selfishness, there is no power that can harmonize the discords of society.

The constitution of the state is a form of the social life, and is dependent, for its character, upon the condition of the families to which its citizens belong. The citizens are, first of all, members of the family; and, therefore, as individuals, they are molded by the life of the families which gave them birth and nurture. Each one may claim, and cling to, his own separate existence, through perversity and selfishness, and so do violence to his own nature, and thereby wrong society. In this way society perpetually suffers defeat, and individuals render their own lives total failures by violating the fundamental laws of life. The last results of such failures are reached in anarchy and assassination. If social order is to be restored such persons, who are the disturbing factors to its peace and happiness, must be elevated to right relations to society, or eliminated, and just to the extent that

this process of regeneration and elimination is carried out, will society be elevated and improved. And to the same extent will nature itself be redeemed from the curse, and render her blessings to mankind. For as man rises morally and spiritually above the degrading power of sin, the earth itself will respond sympathetically to the touch of her natural lord.

If this is true, then the elevation of society, and our right relation to nature, can be secured only by the regeneration of individual and family life.

It is altogether useless to talk of reforming society as a whole, in order to reach the individuals of which it is composed. Just here is where many of the reformers of our day make their fatal mistake. They begin at the wrong end. Their endeavors look like trying to change the course of nature, or attempting to make the waters of the river flow from the mouth to the source. It is like purifying the waters in the ocean in order to disinfect the poisonous streams that flow into it. Their theory and methods of procedure are diametrically opposed to those of Jesus and of His Church; and this, coupled with their fulminations against the Church, reveals the animus which largely rules their efforts. The Church, true to the methods and practices of the Master, seeks to save the individuals, and preserve the purity and moral character of the family, well knowing that the well-being of society must be secured through the individuals and families of which it forms the aggregate. Or, more definitely, the Church, in obedience to the example and commands of the Savior, aims to regenerate the individual life and character, and thus to purify society in its source, and thereby elevate it as a whole.

The so-called reformers, on the contrary, imagine that the prosperity and worldly interests of individuals depend on the prosperity and interests of society. And accordingly they ignore, if they do not openly execrate, the Church of Christ, because it makes religion the chief concern. They want reforms without religion. They would revolutionize govern-



ments, or even destroy them, that society may be reorganized on a basis different from that on which it naturally rests. This, for them, is the panacea for all the ills of life. Here is their great mistake. Morality divorced from religion is of little value. Religion, without morality is superstition. But morality and religion combined, that is, Christian morality, is the great desideratum. The want of it is the running sore of that part of the social organism where the evils are most keenly suffered.

In some instances our reformers appeal to the teaching and practices of Jesus to justify their course. But there is not a single instance in which He attacked the constitution of the state, or animadverted on the organism of society, as He found them. On the contrary He dealt solely with individual men and women; for He well knew, that whenever the influence of His religion becomes the ruling power of the individual life, it will enter savingly into the family, and, fostered and nourished in the family life, it must lay hold of society; and, like leaven in the meal, it will gradually pervade the whole, and eliminate the abnormal conditions which afflict it, without the violence of revolution. In this Jesus was closely followed by the Apostles, who honored the state, regarding "the powers that be, as ordained of God," and advised obedience. And they did not forget the precept of Jesus: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's."

Again, history demonstrates that the leaven of Christianity has been gradually elevating the moral character of society, and purifying state and national governments, in about the proportion that individuals and families have submitted to its ameliorating influence. And its ameliorating effects are seen in all countries where this divine religion is permitted, in its own legitimate way, to mold the lives of individuals, and where the home life of the people is prevailingly of the Christian type.

Since the time of Christ a gradual transformation and

improvement of society has been going forward, and is visible among all the peoples where the spirit of His religion has come to prevail. Such a great change may be observed already to have made its mark upon the Roman Empire long before its dissolution. For example, its cruel system of slavery was greatly modified, and took a far more humane aspect than it bore under pagan rule, while many wealthy Christians of that early day, are known to have manumitted their slaves, and treated them as brethren. This is freely admitted by Gibbon, the historian of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

The marriage relation once treated as a civil contract, became, through the influence of the Church, a sacrament; no longer a loose partnership that might be dissolved, *ad libitum*, by the contracting parties, it became a religious institution in which husband and wife became one for life; and the union thus effected formed the Christian home. Man and wife became "one flesh," and the morals of the people were elevated and improved. This Christian influence, through missionary efforts, spread abroad through all European countries, and transformed their barbarous tribes into the great Christian nations.

Corruptions, relics of barbarism, and savage life, were engrafted into the Church, and lowered its standard of social life. But yet the Church, with firm hand, asserted and maintained its authority, and taught them a higher order of life and civilization.

The feudalism of the middle ages was an improvement on the previous social life. It was only an incident of the transition from the brutalism of barbarism, but it was a great advance towards the high state of civilization which followed the Reformation. Knight errantry, with its high respect for women, shows the upward trend of society in relation to the downtrodden sex. But this again was superseded, when, after the Reformation, woman took her rightful place beside her husband, as his helpmeet and equal, in the great concerns of the family life. Since then the advance in this direction,

has been permanent, if not as rapid as desired. In the early ages we sometimes discern a retrograde movement in the ethical and social domain. Whenever the elements of paganism were permitted to mingle too freely with Christianity, within the Church, which was sometimes the case, they infused into the social organism a demoralizing and degrading influence, which dragged down religion towards their own lower level. This was true both among the Latin and the Teutonic races. These retrograde movements appear in the history of the times for many centuries. It is unnecessary to specify. Any one conversant with the history of Christianity can verify these statements. And yet it is also true that Christianity carried with it an elevating influence, which, in each succeeding age, raised the people to a higher level, and, out of the social chaos, constructed a *social order*, a higher civilization, and advanced society to a more excellent standard of morals. Thus, while society was oftentimes almost disorganized, and the obligations and restraints of Christian civilization almost obliterated, the recuperative forces of Christianity were asserted again, in the reorganization of the social system. And, under its benign influence, domestic, social, and national institutions were raised up, of a far higher order than those which were displaced by the irruptions of barbarism.

And so it went on in the social organism, undulating like the waves of the sea; each succeeding wave of civilization rising higher and higher, above the intervening depressions, until the Reformation of the sixteenth century, when Christianity, with its humanizing energies entered upon the modern stage of its civilizing activity. And, in spite of the drawbacks of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it has continued its sanctifying work, and raised the social organism to the high eminence which it occupies at the beginning of the twentieth century.

From this high vantage ground we can look out upon the future with a joyful faith in its power to regenerate and

purify eventually the whole human race. And we may well assert that the progress of the nineteenth century, in the social, civil, and religious condition of mankind, is sufficient warrant for the hope of a far more glorious advancement in the twentieth century.

The advancement in scientific, material, and commercial interests, has been made tributary to the moral and spiritual concerns of man. And no one can truthfully deny that these latter have kept pace with the former, notwithstanding the unprecedented rapidity with which the resources and energies of nature have been developed and harnessed to the car of material progress, which has carried our civilization to remote and hitherto inaccessible corners of the earth.

A few of the encouraging things, aside from the material progress of the age, may here be mentioned, as surely indicating that the social organism has reached an altitude far above anything hitherto attained, and encouraging the hope that the influences which have brought us thus far will continue in lively exercise, until the social life of man universally may reach the status when it may be called *par excellence* the SOCIAL ORDER.

1. The intellectual status of the people has advanced vastly beyond what it was, even a hundred years ago. We mean by this that the educational facilities now afforded have made common education well nigh universal in the United States, and in England, Germany, and other Christian nations. This we regard as one great factor in securing a higher social position for the people. And, in addition to this high privilege, the low prices at which the best literature can be bought make it possible for the poor to profit intellectually by reading the thoughts of the best writers, while photography, printing, and all kindred arts enable all to beautify their homes with copies of the finest creations of genius. Musical instruments likewise bring joy into many homes, to an extent which was impossible a century ago. These exercise a humanizing and uplifting power, and serve to soften the asperities of life among the lowly.

2. The so-called middle classes, and very many of the lower classes, enjoy social advantages far beyond those of their fathers of a hundred, or even of fifty years ago. The aristocracy of a few decades in the past is passing away, and the pride of pedigree is giving place to the principle of the Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal."

The majority live in better houses, often their own property, with better furnishings and more desirable environments than those of their parents. Their tables are better supplied, and they are better clothed than people of past centuries.

We must admit, of course, that there are many exceptions, which are to be lamented. We can not close our eyes to the wretchedness and want still suffered among the very poor, and to the oppressions to which some are subjected. Neither can we forget that very many are reaping the reward of their own misdoings, and that they resist, and sometimes resent, all efforts for their moral elevation and social deliverance, preferring to wallow in the mire of sin and misery, rather than to rise into a better state of life.

And yet we believe that present conditions, in the social organism, are full of promise for the future, because these promising conditions have been reached through a gradual uplifting process, which is yet going forward with renewed energy and force. And besides this, we have come to a consciousness of our deficiencies, which is itself a promise of better things to come.

3. Slavery, which cursed the world and blighted the hopes of men for so many ages, has been effectually destroyed everywhere, except in a few obscure corners of the earth. And, judging from the past, we may assuredly believe that in the proportion that Christianity comes to prevail it will bring freedom and happiness into those dark places.

4. The vast movements in the interests of temperance which are agitating all Christian countries are exerting a salutary influence in high places and low. The rich and poor

alike are coming into touch with these movements, and are uniting their forces in the interests of sobriety and moderation; and the effects are plainly seen in the social order. Much, indeed, remains to be done on this line, before society at large can reach the high-water mark of Christian ethics. But the forces at work are constantly gaining adherents and influence, not only among private citizens, but among those who are chosen to make and execute the laws, and while we may not expect an absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic for a long time to come, yet we hope to see the business put under such legal restriction, and moral proscription, that its power for evil will be reduced to the minimum. With the advancement of the cause of temperance, we expect a corresponding rise in social life to a higher level.

5. Another evidence of advancement in the universal social order, appears in the promulgation of the principle of arbitration, in the settlement of disputes, whether between employer and employe, or between nation and nation. We can not claim a very great advance in this line of social progress, but a beginning has been made. Some disputes have already been settled in this way. Strikes of working men have been averted or avoided, and in some instances wars have been prevented. And it augurs well that most of the civilized nations have taken the subject into serious consideration; and an international tribunal has been organized, through whose good offices national disputes may be adjusted without an appeal to the arbitrament of war. Thus the leaven of peace is quietly working its way; and we trust the twentieth century will witness, to a large degree, the cessation of bloody conflicts, and that a peaceful settlement of national misunderstandings may be secured, and that capital and labor may harmonize their interests by a mutual recognition of each other's welfare. Thus they will contribute their correlative shares in elevating the social order, and in making it a greater blessing to all.

6. Lastly, the demand for the enactment of better laws regarding marriage and divorce, and recognizing more fully

the sanctity of the conjugal relation, and the sacredness of the family, shows a growing appreciation of the home. In this the law promulgated by the blessed Master is coming to be recognized as the true law of the home. However glaring, therefore, and degrading to our Christian civilization, have the frequency of divorce, and the sundering of the most sacred of all earthly relations appeared to the eyes of all virtuous people, we yet discern a growing sentiment of righteous indignation, whose frown will, eventually, drive the demon of unchastity to its own dark abode.

The laws of the land will be brought into harmony with the law of Christ. And through these beneficent laws, themselves the offspring of a lofty Christian civilization, the sacredness of the home will be protected and maintained, and its sanctifying power will go out into all ranks of the social organism, like a purifying stream, and wash away its pollutions.

Now, in view of these considerations, notwithstanding the many great and crying evils that yet degrade and afflict the social organism, the outlook for the future seems full of promise. The Church of Christ, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, will continue her God-appointed work, until the social life of mankind has been reduced to SOCIAL ORDER, when all shall recognize, through her ministrations, the grace of God which bringeth salvation and happiness to all mankind.



## II.

### DEMONOLOGY AND THE DARK ARTS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID S. SCHAFF, D.D.

The personal agency of evil spirits in the realm of human action has been almost wholly set aside by our modern thought. In the Middle Ages the belief in such agency was universal. The easy credulity of ignorance peopled the earth and air with malevolent beings who were incessantly engaged with their fell devices to effect human action and thwart the good. The theologians of the period joined in establishing by scientific treatment the reality of this activity and thus furnished a firm ground for the popular superstition. It is a strange phenomenon that after twelve centuries of Christian culture the doctrine of demons and the belief in the dark arts reached their meridian. Then it was that the dread of the demonic activity began to take on the form of a craze which spread from Rome to Scotland and from Spain to Sweden, set communities almost frantic and brought to an awful death tens of thousands of innocent victims. Nor were our own shores kept free from the spell of the terrible delusion and persecution which claimed its nineteen victims at Salem. And John Wesley nearly a century later, 1768, referring to occurrences in his own time, declared that giving up witchcraft was in effect giving up the Bible.\*

The general term for the dark arts and the agency of evil spirits among the Romans and in the church down to the 1200

\* The latest treatment of this subject is by Joseph Hansen in two thorough books *Zauberglaube, Inquisition und Hexenglaube im Mittelalter*, 1900; and *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Hexenwahns und Hexenverfolgung im Mittelalter*, 1901. They will take the place heretofore occupied by the thorough work of Soldan as edited by Heppe in two volumes, Stuttgart, 1880.

was *maleficium*. It was used officially by Diocletian. To the conceptions which were derived from Scripture and taken from the Romans, were added the wild beliefs of the Norse mythology through the contact of the tribes of the North with the Church.

As in the other departments of theological thought so in the treatment of Satan and his realm the statements of Augustine were the starting point and the chief authority for the Schoolmen. Leaning back upon the great African teacher, Thomas Aquinas (died 1274) in his *Summa* and his *Commentary* on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard developed his elaborate system of demonology. This does not mean, of course, that the great Schoolman does not look to the Scriptures for his authority. He does and is thoroughly conversant with them. But to him Augustine was the master, their authoritative expounder. With Thomas the brilliant galaxy of Schoolmen, who were his contemporaries or belonged to the age succeeding his own, fully agreed, Albertus Magnus, Alexander of Hales, his great Franciscan contemporary, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, Durandus and others. This scholastic treatment, establishing the popular notions on an authoritative basis, left the ecclesiastical and civil courts no alternative but to prosecute all alleged cases of sorcery, witchcraft, necromancy or other activity which was ascribed directly to personal demonic agency.

Augustine's views are given in scattered statements, especially in the fifth and eighteenth books of his *De Civitate Dei*. The pagan gods were demons, he says. Like the good angels, the bad spirits have bodies. By God's permission they have power to stir up storms, start diseases and blast harvests. To them the power is not given of creating new substances but they have ability to accelerate the growth of seeds and the development of potencies, hidden to men. It is possible for the soul, when the body is asleep, to transport itself or be transported through the air. Men and women have sexual intercourse with demons, fauns and sylvans. "To deny

this" he says, "is impudence." Much of the alleged demonic influence of this day he relegates to the realm of jugglery and legerdemain.

For the next eight centuries no doubt is expressed of the subtle personal influence of evil spirits over men and of the consequent superhuman powers of men exercised in sorcery and necromancy in the interest of evil. Agobard, the enlightened archbishop of Lyons, about 850 tried to check the crass credulity on the subject and ridiculed the idea that the *tempestarii* or weather-makers have any power to change the weather, but he did not call in question the reality of sorcery. Gregory the Great, two centuries before him, elaborated the doctrine of the evil realm in such a way that Harnack in his *History of Doctrine* calls him "the Doctor of angels and the devil." He tells for example of a nun who, picking up a lettuce leaf in the convent garden and swallowing it before making the sign of the cross, swallowed with it a devil. "I was sitting on the leaf and she ate me," expostulated the imp. But in spite of his expostulation St. Aegidius forced him to depart. The Penitential Books of the seventh and eighth centuries make frequent mention of sorcerers and magic and provide ecclesiastical punishments. Peter Damiani (about 1050) has many stories of the active agency of demons. So have the writers during the next two centuries. Walter Mapes and John of Salisbury, the two English travelled men of the period, accepted with some modification the popular views but are both assured of the pestiferous familiarity of men and evil spirits. With the older theologians they represent Ceres, Bacchus, Pan, the satyrs as demons. The evil spirits have power over the weather. That prince of narrators, Cesar of Heisterbach (about 1225) in his *Dialogus Miraculorum* represents an old monk as answering the objections of a novice about sorcery and witchcraft. He knew of the devil appearing as a black man, an ox, a dog, an ape, a cat and pig and even as a prior and nun. The popular imagination invested the devil with horns, tail and claws. The French poetry of

the 12th and 13th centuries has many references to these appendages although the *Roman de la Rose* makes light of them. A funny incident is given as late as the sixteenth century by the Court preacher of the Duke of Weimar (1566). On a visit to Treves he was shown one of the devil's claws and was told that he had kicked at a new altar where mass was about to be said and left the claw behind. If there was any doubt in the Middle Ages about the reality of the dark arts, it has not been left on record. Even Roger Bacon, while declaring some of the popular notions delusions, affirmed his belief in sorcery, declaring that spells and charms depended upon their being made under the proper aspects of the heavens.

With the thirteenth century, say about 1250, a new period begins in the treatment of the dark arts. The great Schoolmen of that age, as already said, gave elaborate treatments of demonology and the agency of evil spirits. They formulated a doctrine in careful statements and sent it out with the seal of their authority. Peter the Lombard, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, and above all Thomas Aquinas were a constellation of brilliant minds scarcely paralleled in any age and they all gave the solemn weight of their names to a number of formulas on the subject that now seem to us to be most grotesque. Certain views, popularly accepted but set aside by Thomas, the Spanish theologians adopted into their systems. But the statements of the great Dominican theologian were universally accepted not only down to the time of the Reformation but, even to a large extent, in Protestant circles as well as Catholic, for several generations after the Reformation.

According to these formulations of the Schoolmen, the demons can know many things it is not given to mortals to know. By reason of mental acuteness and long experience they can foretell the future. They cannot create but they can accelerate the development of germs and hidden potencies. Their special influence over human beings in sorcery and

witchcraft grows out of a compact entered into with them by men and women. The passage frequently quoted by the Schoolmen in favor of this compact is Isaiah 28: 18—"We have made a covenant with death and with Sheol are we at agreement." One of the earliest stories narrated of such compact, going back perhaps to 400, was associated with the life of Basil of Cæsarea. It ran thus: A slave in order to secure the affections of the daughter of a senator made a covenant with the devil to serve him and apostatize from Christ. The contract was solemnly entered into in a graveyard. The slave got his desire but Basil supplicated so effectively that Satan relinquished his hold upon his dupe. Marlow's Dr. Faustus and Goethe's great creation, Faust, embodied the mediæval belief and the teaching of the Schoolmen.

The evil spirits influence the weather, so Thomas affirmed, and produce sickness and death. The Book of Job was appealed to as Scriptural authority for the power of the devil over storms. The most fiendish of their activities is directed against the marriage bond. Men they make impotent, women sterile. The earlier doctrine of the *succubus* and the *incubus*, Thomas fully adopted; namely the *succubus*, that demons cohabit with men and the *incubus* that they cohabit with women. Yea, the Schoolmen affirm, that though the demons do not have direct offspring, yet after lying with men they have power to suddenly transform themselves into the male sex and communicate the seed they have received to the woman. Thomas develops the doctrine into detail as do also Bonaventura and Duns Scotus. But Thomas at the same time denies that the sons of God who in Genesis took to themselves daughters of men were angels. They were the children of Seth. It was thought by some that the anti-Christ would be engendered in this way by the intercourse of a demon with a woman. Guibert of Nogent (about 1120) mentions that his father and mother were for some time prevented from exercising the privileges of wedlock till a good angel came to their rescue and drove off the evil spirit. It was matter of solemn dis-

cussion whether this form of influence was a just cause of divorce and Thomas answered in the affirmative. On the other hand Albertus Magnus and other Schoolmen find it difficult to understand why the devil should promote abstinence in the marriage bed. Was not concupiscence the seed of original sin? But this very fact, they say, explains why God gives to the devil a certain liberty over the relation of the sexes.

The transport of men and women through the air is also taught by Thomas. Such events as the flight of the prophet Habakkuk through the air to Babylon and back,\* the experience of our Lord in his temptation and the experience of Philip, the Evangelist, are the Scriptural cases appealed to. These great teachers might have learned better things from the priest of whom Vincent Beauvais in the thirteenth century speaks. A woman was assuring the priest that under the influence of an evil spirit she and a number of other women had entered into his room by the key hole. Locking the door and putting the key in his pocket the sceptical ecclesiastic gave the woman a good drubbing, saying: "Now prove your case and get out through the key hole, if you can." Cesar Heisterbach knew no doubts on the subject of aerial locomotion and tells this among other cases. A woman fell back from a cask, exclaiming "Now I jump out of the power of God into the power of the devil. Then the devil carried her up into the air and carried her over the forests." Albertus Magnus and Alexander of Hales associated these women, who fly about in the night, with Diana and Herodias in whose train they follow. Turrecremata, the Spanish commentator, wisely gives up this opinion on the ground that Diana never existed and it is not at all certain whether Herodias is allowed to leave hell. But he holds on firmly to the general fact that at night human beings are transported through the air.

These Scholastic definitions of the thirteenth century mark an epoch in the treatment of sorcery and the dark arts in the civil and ecclesiastical tribunals. Up to 1250 the number of

\* In Bel and the Dragon.



executions for sorcery are very small, and sorcery came under the cognizance of the civil court. The cases are rare where it was made a matter of the ecclesiastical tribunal. An exception is the Synod of Riesbach, 799, which provides the penalty of imprisonment for sorcerers but forbids the death penalty. The so-called *canon episcopi*, which appears for the first time in the tenth century and was then ascribed to the Council of Ancyra, summons the bishops to root out sorcery. The *Decretals* of Gratian prescribe excommunication for those who practice it. But the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, in establishing the Inquisition for heresy, does not mention sorcery. The codes of Frederick II. twenty years later regard it solely as a crime against the state and as coming under the jurisdiction of the civil tribunal while heresy he relegates to the ecclesiastical court to be punished with death. Gregory IX., one of Frederick's opponents, marks clearly the transition to a new view. He calls upon the state to exterminate persons in league with demons and in 1233 declared that the devil was accustomed to appear in the assemblies of his human devotees as a toad or a black tomcat and that they kiss his posterior parts as a sign of homage. The opinion gained recognition that the same methods should be pursued with sorcery as with heresy and that the Inquisition should, at least, have equal rights with the civil tribunal to ferret it out and prosecute it. When the Schoolmen gave the weight of their great authority to the common views there was nothing left for both courts to do but to proceed vigorously to the task of punishing these offenders. Trials suddenly multiplied. The confessions of the accused corroborated the Scholastic statements. To be sure they were extracted under the merciless exactions of torture, but they were none the less trustworthy. As in the Crusades the attempt was made to conquer an external kingdom so now the effort was made to clear the earth of the troops of men and women who had entered into alliance with demons, instead of casting out the real works of darkness in human hearts in high places and low.



A panic took hold of the mind of Western Europe. Popes like John XXI. and Boniface VIII. were reported to be in league with the devil or to have continually with them a familiar spirit. John XXII. (1316-1334), himself greatly in dread of spells and philtres, and his successor Benedict XIV. were active in the prosecution of sorcery. Interrogatories used by the Inquisition for sorcery date back to 1300. In 1376 Eymericus, in his celebrated Inquisitorial Directory, detects the closest affinity between sorcery and heresy and two years later the University of Paris sent forth 28 articles strongly affirming its reality. The most revolting confessions were extorted from women, as for example, at Toulouse where a woman under torture declared that for many years she had had sexual intercourse with a demon and had finally given birth to a monster, part wolf and part serpent, which she fed on murdered children for two years when it disappeared.

Witchcraft, with its distinguishing traits, was fully developed in the fifteenth century. These traits are the flight of human beings through the air, sometimes on stools, goats, dogs and other creatures, and the weekly meetings or Sabbaths at which the bewitched met the devil and his angels. The witches were now regarded as an organized sect. In the epidemics in Normandy in 1453 they were called *scobaces* or broom-riders. Taught by the demons, witches made a salve out of the ashes of a toad fed on the sacred wafer, the blood of murdered children and other ingredients which they used to facilitate their aerial flight.

Some of the principal places for meeting were the Brocken, Benevento and beyond the Jordan. Here thousands of witches gathered every week. The knowledge of these things came through the confessions of the participants themselves. On one occasion the Inquisitor of Como, a famous witch region, and two others attended such a meeting at Mendrisio, looking on at the orgies from a place of concealment. The presiding demon dismissed the assembly as if unaware of their presence but immediately calling the revellers back, they dragged the

intruders forth and belabored them so lustily that they survived only a few weeks. At these assemblages the form in which the devil usually appeared was that of a tom-cat or a large goat. He was wont to descend a ladder, if it were in a room, tail foremost. The witches then proceeded to kiss his posteriors. A rich feast followed. Then the lights were extinguished and at a command from the devil *Melez, melez*, they proceeded to abandon themselves to promiscuous and unbridled orgies. Such things were ascribed to the Cathari and other heretical sects and had been charged against the early Christians of the Roman Empire.

By the middle of the fifteenth century the trials were going on on a vast scale. Germany, southern France and northern Italy were the scene of the greatest activity. In England laws against magic and soothsaying had been passed in the Anglo-Saxon period and under the law for the burning of heretics (1401) not a few of these unfortunate people were put to death. But the persecution never took on the proportions it did on the Continent. It is said there was only one execution in Ireland. It grew out of the famous case of Lady Alice Kyteler, 1325. By 1500 quite a voluminous literature had grown up on the subject of witchcraft. Two documents stand out in notorious prominence above the rest of their kind in that age and are the most famous writings on witchcraft of all time, the Witches' Bull of Innocent VIII., 1484, and the *Malleus Maleficarum* or *Witches Hammer* (Hexenhammer) of 1487. These prove beyond a question the state of public opinion in Europe on the eve of the Reformation.

Innocent VIII.'s bull, issued one year after Luther's birth, is one of those little items in the history of the papacy which it would be very convenient for the advocates of papal infallibility to have out of the way. It was propounded in answer to questions sent in by German Inquisitors, and gives full recognition to the current beliefs in sorcery and witchcraft. The document declares that the dioceses of Mainz, Cologne, Treves, Salzburg and Bremen were teeming with practisers of

these dark arts, and calls upon the inquisitors to do well their work. It speaks of both sexes in those regions having carnal intercourse with fiends. These make men impotent, women sterile, the well sick, destroy crops, murder children and do other malific acts. Whether intentionally or not, the bull does not mention the witches' Sabbath and the flight through the air. Here is a translations of a part of the famous deliverance: "To our great grief, it has recently come to our knowledge that in some parts of upper Germany—namely in the sees of Mainz, Cologne, Treves, Salzburg and Bremen—very many of both sexes, unmindful of their own salvation and deviating from the Catholic faith, lie with *succubi* and *incubi*, and by incantations and by songs and other conjurations, by wicked superstitions and soothsayings, by excesses, crimes and sins destroy, suffocate and extinguish the bearing of women, the offspring of animals, the fruits of the earth, the grapes of the vine and the fruit of trees; yea, men, women, cattle, and all sorts of other animals, and all sorts of fruits and vegetables; and they also afflict with the most dire external and internal torments men, women, cattle and stock and impede men that they can not procreate and women that they cannot conceive and render men that they cannot perform conjugal acts with their wives and women with their husbands," etc.

This fulmination would seem to be sufficiently distinct and detailed. It proved to be so for all practical purposes at that day and the inquisitors proceeded to carry out its provisions with untiring energy and merciless exactness.

One pope after another of the fifteenth century had called for the prosecution of proficient in magical arts—Eugenius IV., 1437; Nicholas V., 1451; Calixtus III., 1457; Sixtus IV., 1479. Innocent's fulmination, being the most detailed, is the most notorious. And it must have contributed greatly to the spread of the delusion. Had the supreme pontiff, conscious of his infallibility, only uttered some well-chosen words condemning the erratic superstitions which had oppressed for so long Christendom as well as pagan society, he would have

prevented the execution of tens of thousands of his fellow men and placed himself among the truly great benefactors of the world. Dr. Andrew D. White says in his *Warfare of Religion and Science* "that of all documents which have issued from Rome, imperial or papal, this has doubtless first and last cost the greatest shedding of blood." The statement is a little too strong perhaps in view of the decree of the fourth Lateran establishing the Inquisition for heresy but it is so near the truth that it is just as well to let it stand without attempt at modification.

There is no denying the authenticity of the bull. The printing press was then at work and the copies of it were struck off rapidly and went everywhere. Pastor, Hergenröther and other less able, if not less conscientious recent Catholic historians have attempted to rescue the doctrine of papal infallibility which Innocent's deliverance seems to impugn. The argument which Pastor makes is that the pope does not formally lay down a doctrine on the subject of sorcery and witchcraft. He proceeds upon the basis of previous papal deliverances and the information which he had received from Germany. This does not make the case any the better for the previous papal deliverances. But even, so Pastor continues to argue, if Innocent be regarded as pronouncing a decision, that decision has no more permanent validity than would a decision upon any non-theological controversy, say a controversy about a benefice. This is in accord with the well-known distinction which is now made between the papal decisions which affect doctrine and those which only affect discipline or administration. The latter even if solemnly promulgated are not necessarily obligatory beyond the case adjudicated. Even such a plain bull as Innocent's cannot effect the authority of the supreme pontiff, for, as Pastor says, quoting Leo I., and the words he uses as the motto of his great work, *Petri dignitas etiam in indigno herede non deficit*.

Turning away from the question of papal infallibility, it is a fact that the bull was allowed to appear as the preface to

the 29 editions of the *Malleus maleficarum* without any protest, the last appearing 1669. Then, it must be remembered that two of the distinguished theologians of the papal household Prierias and Spina expound the positions of the bull and the latter appeals directly to the bulls of two other and later popes, Julius II. and Hadrian VI. and these expositions were in high standing in the Church. Some pope has still the opportunity to begin a new Index of forbidden books, which might claim acceptance from all reasonable men, and put this bull and the book it accompanied at its head.

The *Malleus maleficarum* or Witches' Hammer which Dr. Lea pronounces "the most pestiferous monument of superstition the world has produced," was the work of the two Dominican Inquisitors in Germany, Heinrich Institoris and Jacob Sprenger. The plea cannot be made that they were uneducated men. They occupied high positions in their order and at the university of Cologne. These are some of the positions they take. The last quarter of the fifteenth century was more given over to the devil than any of its predecessors. In reaffirming the antics and crimes already spoken of, they appeal to the Scriptures and to the teaching of Augustine and of the Schoolmen, especially Thomas Aquinas. There is an organized sect of witches and sorcerers whose founder is the devil. The members meet at the weekly Sabbaths and do the devil homage by kissing his posteriors. He appears among them as a tom-cat, goat, dog, bull or black man, as whim and convenience suggest. Demons of both sexes swarm at the meetings. Baptism and the eucharist are ridiculed, the cross trampled upon. After an abundant repast, the lights are extinguished and the devil gives his command and then follows a scene of indescribable lewdness. The devil, however, is a disciplinarian and applies the whip to refractory members.

The human part of the fraternity are instructed in all sorts of fell arts. They are transported through the air. They kill children, that is the unbaptized, keeping them in this way out of heaven. At the Sabbaths they are eaten. Of the carnal

intercourse implied in the words *succubus* and *incubus* the authors say, there can be no doubt. To quote them, "this is common to all sorcerers and witches to practice carnal lust (*spurcitias carnales*) with demons."

In evidence of the reality of these charges the authors draw upon their own full experience and declare that in 48 cases of witches brought before them and burned, all the victims confessed to having practiced such abominable whoredoms for from 10 to 30 years. These were, of course, secured under the enormities of the rack.

In the third part of the book, are given directions for the prosecution of witches. The accused were to be subjected to the indignity of having the hair shaved off from their bodies, especially the more secret parts, lest perchance some imp might be lurking there. In case the defender of such a person seemed to show an excess of zeal in his defence, this was to be taken as presumptive evidence that he was himself under the influence of sorcery. One of the devices given for detecting the alleged crime of the witch was to take a sheet of paper of the length of Christ's body, write on it the seven words of the cross, bind it about the witch's body at the time of the mass, especially on some holy day, and then immediately proceed with the torture. This was almost sure, it was said, to extort a true testimony which inevitably meant a confession of guilt.

The most revolting part of this notorious manual is the author's utterly low estimate of womanhood. If any one still thinks that celibacy is a sure highway to purity of thought, let him simply read the testimonies of writers on these subjects, priests and monks, about women. Such impurities of thought are worthy of the foulest purloins of fornication and lust. The title of the book is in the feminine because, as the authors say, the great majority of those who have alliance with demons are women. *Haeresis dicenda est non maleficorum sed malificarum ut fiat a potiori denominatio.* In flat contrast to our modern experience of the religious fidelity of women, they derive *femina*, the word for woman, from *fides minus*, less in



faith. The cohabitation with fiends was in earlier ages, they affirm, against the will of women but in that age it was with their full consent and by their ardent desire (*pro voluntate foeditissima*). They thank God for being men for few of their sex, they say, consent to these obscene relations. This refusal was due to their natural vigor of mind, *vigor rationis*. To show the depravity of woman and her fell agency in history they quote all the bad things they can heap up from authors biblical and classic, Patristic and Scholastic, from Jesus Sirach's "Woman is more bitter than death" down. Helen, Jezebel and Cleopatra are held forth as examples of those whose pernicious agency wrought the destruction of kingdoms, such catastrophes being almost invariably due to women's machinations. A single other quotation will show that this low and vile idea of womankind was not characteristic of Institoris and Sprenger. In his *de planctu ecclesiae* written from Avignon about 1332 and directed against the pamphleteers who were then attacking the papacy, Bishop Alvarez of Pelayo enumerates 102 faults common to women and one of these is her cohabitation with the denizens of hell. From his own experience the prelate says he knew this to be true. It was practiced, he says, in a convent of nuns and in vain he tried to put a stop to it.

With the bull of Innocent and the *Malleus maleficarum* widely circulated, the horizon of the period just preceding the Reformation became lurid with the flames in which men and women were consumed for this awful superstition. Popes Alexander VI., Julius II. and Leo X. as well as Hadrian VI. (1523) urged on the vigorous prosecution of the poor wretches in Northern Italy where the civil authorities, as in the case of Brescia and Venice, were inclined to be lax. The attitude of the signory of Brescia changed and in 1510 alone we have record of 70 executions for witchcraft in that city. What effect these monstrous representations and threats must have had on delicate and sensitive women and ignorant communities may easily be surmised. There was, in our



modern sense, no protection of law for the accused. The suspicion of an ecclesiastical or civil court was sufficient to create an almost insurmountable presumption of crime. The torture was invariably brought into requisition and no one can read anything about the horrors and merciless persistence in its use, and wonder that the victims, frantic with pain, would be willing to confess to anything, however untrue and repulsive it might be. And these victims, no doubt, thought death infinitely preferable to the protracted agonies of the rack, for the pains of death at best, last a few hours and might be reduced to a few minutes. As Lecky in his *History of Rationalism* has said, they did not have before them the prospect of a martyr's crown and the glory of the heavenly estate. They were not buoyed up by the sympathies and prayers of friends. The Church had cast them off as reprobate and in collusion with demons. So, unpitied, unprayed for, they looked forth into a black future as they cowered away from the scrutiny of the Inquisitor or were consumed in the flames.

Are we to suppose there were no dissenting voices from these awful judgments? Probably there were. Probably many a community looked on with silent horror and a certain grimness of hate for the authorities. But it did not come to recorded expression. Reuchlin pronounced in 1494 the sorceries of the Egyptian magicians delusions but he did not condemn the belief in sorcery. Erasmus alleged the pact with the devil to be an invention, but he did not deny the reality of witchcraft or reprobate the execution of witches. Ulrich von Hutten made merry over the cat shape of the devil and Hans Sachs in 1531 writes of the transformation of demons into cats

Des Teufels Eh und Reuterei  
Ist nur Gespenst und Fantasy

In Spain at the time of the Reformation the densest superstition prevailed on the subject. In 1520 in Germany and France the trials were transferred to the civil court but the trials and the executions went on without abatement. The Reformation brought no relief. A bright Roman Catholic

writer, Diefenbach, has tried to prove that in German Protestant circles the belief was more deep-seated and the executions more frequent than in German Catholic circles. It is true that the Reformers on the Continent and in England believed in witchcraft and did not lift their hand to stop the persecutions. Luther was a stout believer in the reality of demonic agency. Calvin allowed the laws against witchcraft in the Genevan code to stand. Bishop Jewel's sermon before Queen Elizabeth in 1562 was perhaps the immediate occasion of the enactment of a new English law on the subject.

It is beyond my intention to follow the history of this craze further. It will be, however, recalled, that James I. was a staunch believer in witchcraft and witnessed trials of witches and had the man tried and executed who stirred up the storm while the king was crossing from Denmark to his realm. In France, England and Germany Bodin, Binsfeld, Delrio, Erastus and Glanvill, otherwise a representative of the dawning scientific spirit, wrote treatises down to 1681, advocating the reality of witchcraft. Nowhere were the trials and tortures of witches more agonizing and pitiless than in Scotland after the Reformation was fully established in that land. And under Cromwell and the Puritan triers sixty suffered death in Suffolk alone.

Of astrology there is no place left to speak. It, too, was one of the dark arts. Scarcely a bishop or prince in Italy that did not have his astrologer in the period of the Renaissance. Julius II. delayed the day of his coronation that it might take place under a lucky star. It is sufficient to say that this art required meditation and seclusion. It was not within the reach of any but the rich. But some of the astrologers also came in for the death penalty. But this did not stop the practice of the art and Wallenstein and many of his contemporaries believed in it. Does not Schiller put into Wallenstein's mouth the words?

The stars lie not; what's happened  
Has turned out against the course of star and fate;  
Art does not play us false. The false heart  
'Tis, which drags falsehood into the truth-telling heavens.

The *Malleus maleficarum* declared that astrology also involved a secret pact with the devil and was to be punished by the Inquisition. In France in 1494 it was condemned to extinction.

In surveying the belief in witchcraft and sorcery in the Church of the Middle Ages, it is evident that it was originally due to the representations of Scripture and the opinions and mythologies handed over to the church from Roman society and by the peoples of the North. The demonic agency in the time of our Lord, Saul's experience with the witch of Endor and the representations of Leviticus and other books of the Old Testament represent some of the authority upon which the Christian theologians based their careful and authoritative definitions. The stories of the contests of the old hermits with the devil and demons were the property of every convent where time hung heavy and were retailed to terrify evil doers. The experiences of the monks of the Middle Ages teem with personal encounters of the same sort. The lonely location of monasteries, the lonely forests and untracked swales, the confused state of the peoples, all contributed to the development of the consciousness and fear of the personal appearance and activity of the malign agents of evil and adversaries of the kingdom of God. The Knights of the Temple succumbed to the charge of being in league with these forces. Heresy and sorcery in the thirteenth century came to be regarded as sisters of the same stock. The name Waldenses was at one time given to witches and the name Cathari—one ingenious writer derived from the word *cat* in whose form, it was charged, the devil appeared to the sect and was worshipped by its members. Then followed the awful mistake that the Church, exercising its right, might condemn such persons to death. The state court took up the cases which the church turned over to it or prosecuted on its own account. Upon the passage of the Pentateuch tremendous stress was laid, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." The modern studies of anthropology and mental pathology were not in vogue, giving rational explana-

tions of the phenomena that seemed to point to personal demonic agency. It is an awful tragedy for these later generations to contemplate. Apologizing is sorry work for we would probably have done the same had we lived in those times. The more genial temper and treatment of our own day are not causes for boasting so much as reasons for humble gratitude to God and a more earnest resolution to cast out the works of darkness rather than to blast human hope and destroy human liberty by assuming the prerogative of God.

### III.

## THE FRAUDS OF SPIRITUALISM.

BY REV. STANLEY L. KREBS, A.M.

### THE BANGS SISTERS (*Continued*).

(*Preliminary Note.*—The first of this series of articles has accomplished some good in a practical way, I am happy to report. First of all it has been given a wide circulation, far beyond my expectation. It appeared, with illustrations, in the *London Journal* (S. P. R.); was translated into Russian by the Hon. Petrovo-Solovovo and published in his psychic review; issued as a serial with illustrations in *Suggestion* a monthly published by Dr. H. A. Parkyn of the Chicago School of Psychology; in *Modern Medical Science* of New York; *Suggester and Thinker* of Columbus, Ohio; and was up for criticism in the spiritualistic press generally of the country.

Results have followed. The Canadian postal authorities refused to allow the Bangs mail to pass when the sisters were in Toronto recently, on the ground that they were frauds and were using the mails for fraudulent purposes. Several of the ministers of Toronto churches took the matter up and remarked the fact that the Bangs had gone out of the "spirit letter" business there and were confining themselves to portrait work! I have been challenged by Mr. C. F. Horine of the Chicago Stock Yards, a life-long Spiritualist, to a definitive test of Spiritualism by means of the Bangs' mediumship upon which he seems to rely. He wants me have more sittings with them under CONDITIONS HE HIMSELF HAS IMPOSED. I have gladly accepted both his challenge and the appended conditions, without a single modification. The American Anti-Spiritualist Association, through its vice-president, Rev. C.

H. Caylor of Columbus, has urged me to push the Horine challenge to a positive and definite issue. I am glad this Association is interested, but I need no urging, for I await with impatience the fulfillment of Mr. Horine's voluntary challenge and propositions, when I shall faithfully record the result.)

In this second article on the frauds practiced by the celebrated Spiritual mediums, the Bangs sisters of Chicago, I present but a small portion of the corroborative testimony that has come to me since my investigation commenced three years ago, testimony both positive and negative of the objective evidences of fraud. The chief discussion however in this article moves around the negative evidences of fraud. Finally I would call the reader's especial attention to "The News Exchange System" and its admirable possibilities for profound deception of the unsuspecting public. The final article to follow this will discuss three other famous mediums of England, America and Germany, with a concluding section on Spiritualism as a whole, negative and positive side. We now present some of the CORROBORATIVE TESTIMONY.

From Dr. Sydney Flower comes more evidence, consisting of excerpts from an article published in *Suggestive Therapeutics* for July, 1899, summing up results of a protracted series of seances with Miss B. He says: "I brought my own slates. The first slates were screwed together at the corners, sealed with sealing wax in the center and at the corners, with string wound round slates, back and forth, and sealed." (Knowing what we now do of Miss B.'s "mediumship," what results would we expect and could we predict from an arrangement of this kind? Just what happened, and which Dr. Flower describes most fully and adequately in just two words.) "No RESULTS. The second slates used were screwed together at the corners, and sealed along the edges. NO RESULTS The third slates used were not screwed together at the corners, but 27 seals were put round the edges, close together. NO RESULTS. The last slates used were nailed to-

gether, and 27 seals put around the edges. No RESULTS. \* \* \* A negative result," he concludes, "proves nothing, and I am quite willing to admit that there may be *something antagonistic* to phenomena in the precautions taken." Yes, decidedly antagonistic! Not, however, for subtle *psychic* reasons, as Dr. F. in his gentlemanly frankness and honesty supposed, but from exceedingly *materialistic* ones. Dr. Flower elsewhere remarks, "The weak point in Miss B.'s work is that she uses rubber bands to hold the slates together. Why a rubber band, if not for ease in handling the letter placed between? However I do not intend to insinuate anything against Miss B.'s work. It may be all right." The bands, as we have now conclusively seen, are used just exactly for the purpose Dr. F. surmises they are. Twine, too, is no effectual barrier. But sealed twine, screws, nails and wax seals are, as he himself discovered, but could not explain.

True, the above is NEGATIVE evidence, but still, negative though it be, it and the discovery I made at the Chicago seance mutually illuminate and explain each other. The strongest, clearest and most direct corroborative testimony of a positive kind comes from Dr. H. A. Parkyn, of the Chicago School of Psychology. To him, in the presence of a mutual friend, Mr. Griffith, I explained in detail the discovery I had made on the evening of the day I made it. He was enthusiastic, and promised to arrange for a seance himself with Miss B. and send me a written account of his experiences. And here it is:

"CHICAGO, April 3, 1900.

"MY DEAR MR. KREBS:

"Everything was very satisfactory. I never lost trace of the letter from the time it was put in between the slates until the slates were opened. I saw her put in the wedge, saw the wedge in between the slates, saw her take the letter out of the slates, saw just when she let it drop, saw the note come inside the door, saw my letter under her foot, and had an interesting wind up with her when I asked her to let me see a letter pad



through the end of which she had thrust my letter. The whole thing was very satisfactory, and I think will please you. I will get the full story away to you as soon as possible, I am very busy." Yours very truly. Herbert A. Parkyn.

DR. PARKYN'S EXPERIMENT.

"Last night, April 11, 1900, my present class numbering fifteen met at the school and I gave them a seance in sleight of hand, etc. Just to test how the Bangs system would go, I posted my father and hid him in the back room. Then I put one of the students at the table in front of me and arranged the chairs of all the others so they could not see MY side of the table. Now, although I had given them some inkling as to how the writing was done, still, if you can believe it, I had one of the students write some questions, placed them between the slates, exactly as was done at the Bangs seance, and inside of HALF AN HOUR had the letter in the slates again with questions answered, and not one student in the room saw the letter drop out, nor did anyone know how it was accomplished. I think I improved on the Bangs method a bit. In the first place I arranged things so *I did not have to turn around sideways* from the table at all. Then again the letter was carried in and out by a black linen thread, a loop having been made in the middle of the string to hold notes and letters. The whole system was devised within a few minutes, and the success of the experiment goes to SHOW THAT THIS IS THE WAY THE BANGS SISTERS ACCOMPLISH IT, even if we had no further evidence. It is much easier of course when you have only one sitter to deal with." Yours very truly, Herbert A. Parkyn.

This concludes the objective evidence of fraud. We now turn to

B. THE SUBJECTIVE AND INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

An examination of the contents of the "spirit" letters.

An examination of these purported "spirit" letters will show up the fraud almost as clearly as the foregoing objective proof. The internal evidence is damaging in the extreme to the claims of the medium.



(3)

Chicago, \_\_\_\_\_ 189\_

My dear Jack:-

Do you still smoke  
in the spiritual world as you  
thought and argued you would?

Staunchly

Yours

My Good Friend & Comrade  
I believe to you to have  
from the eternal world that  
I now inhabit. I have found  
that this world are that my  
fanciest hopes had painted  
Some things difficult of course  
for it is impossible to find  
clothed with the trappings of  
the human body to - conceive  
of the spiritual grandeur



Chicago, \_\_\_\_\_ 189\_\_\_\_\_

My Dear

Most Gladly do I greet  
you through this medical arena  
to day the thinking fine added  
proof of the glorious spiritual  
philosophy that I have found  
to be more than two series  
entering the world of spirit  
steadily - You ask me  
how many are frauds out  
of a hundred mediums.  
But I cannot calculate this  
or would I be permitted to  
tell you. Could I your  
world is one of experience  
My God and each  
experience is as a lesson

We will discuss 1. The chirography, and 2. The subject matter of these letters.

I had sent four questions to "spirit" world, three of which were answered, or rather I should say had replies attached. Why the fourth had not will be explained in a moment. First let us study the significant features of

#### THE CHIROGRAPHY.

Of the three answered letters two are presented herewith in facsimile reproduction by protographic processes. Only the first page of each is given, as that is quite sufficient to exhibit the points I wish to call attention to. One of them, Cut 3, contains my own handwrite.

Now if these two letters be carefully compared, it will be noticed 1. They seem to be written by different hands. The writing is not, apparently, at first glance, alike. 2. Nevertheless, when the following details are examined and accurately compared, it will be seen that they have BEEN WRITTEN BY ONE AND THE SAME HAND, for the words here indicated, and which fortunately for our purpose, occur in both letters, are in type and form exactly alike: The capital "I's" (which occur five times in one letter and twice in the other), "World" (twice in each letter), "spiritual" (once in each letter), "I have found" (once in each letter), "to-day" (once in each letter), "this" (three times in one, once in the other), "the" (once in one, three times in the other), "you" (three times in one, once in the other).

I repeat, when these details are critically compared, the resemblance will be found so striking there will be no mistaking them. "He that runneth may read." 3. In the first letter the top lines are quite different from the bottom lines, the change proceeding quite gradually in the body of the page. It looks as if the writer started out by *trying to imitate* a foreign and unaccustomed hand, and then gradually, *forgetting herself*, relapsed into her own handwriting; called "her own" from the fact that the bottom lines of this letter and the flow-

ing handwrite of the second letter as well as that of the third (which I did not deem necessary for this reason to reproduce) are all of one type and of the same character.

Now then, if the claim of these mediums be true that their "guides" mystically produced the writing, after deriving in spirit-world the information requested by the sitter from the "spirits," then the actual execution on the letter paper is done by the "guide," and in this way *similarity* of handwrite is accounted for even when three or more spirits are communicating. If, then, the "guide" of Miss B. wrote my three letters, how are we to account for the DIFFERENCES, namely, the angularity and extreme lean of the letters and lines in the first letter, changing gradually IN THAT SAME LETTER to the more even, straight and regular style which appears in the second and third letter? Was the "guide" trying to imitate my several friends' respective chirographies? If so, the "guide" made a most ignominious blunder of the job, for there is about as much resemblance between this spirit writing and that of my friends as there is between the map of Europe and the United States!

On the other hand, if *each* "spirit" is supposed to execute *his own* writing direct, then why the SIMILARITY IN TYPE, why are all the letters formed so unmistakably after one and the same mould? So either horn of the dilemma bristles with difficulties for the mediumistic claims of the Bangs sisters.

But there is one explanation, clear and simple, which meets all the phases of the case and sweeps away all the difficulties. And that explanation is simply this: Miss B.'s confederate in the next room tried her best to execute different handwrites, for each name addressed, as her ingenuity and general knowledge suggested—a shaky or angular hand for one, an even style for another, etc.—supposing in this way to *impress the sitter*; but although she got the lean and width and height of the letters varied, nevertheless she failed completely to disguise the TYPE or STYLE peculiar to herself, which tell-tale type accordingly appears in all the letters and is capable of easy discovery and identification even by the non-expert.

To sum up. Let the reader take time to compare the two letters thoughtfully and carefully, and then ask himself the following questions: 1. If they were written by the same hand, why the general differences that are so apparent? 2. If written by different hands, why are the capital "I's" and other details so strikingly similar in general construction? Let the reader try to answer these questions, and the only solution to which the mind will inevitably be led is contained in the one word "FRAUD." The whole thing is transparent fraud and consummate humbug.

#### CONTENTS OR SUBJECT-MATTER.

The first question I asked was this:—"My Dear Uncle Will:—What now in spirit life do you think of Spiritualism and of mediums? Are they frauds or aren't they? How many out of a hundred are frauds? Sincerely your old friend and nephew, Stanley L. Krebs."

This is the reply I got, punctuation marks and all:—"My Dear:—Most gladly do I greet you through this medial avenue to day and thereby give added proof of this glorious Spiritual philosophy that I have found to be more than true since entering the world of spirits Stanley—You ask me how many are frauds out of a hundred mediums. But I cannot calculate this or would I be permitted to tell you could I. Your world is one of experiences my good—(blank or gap here)—and each experience is a lesson to you—You will find frauds and decept in all things—And as you study each thought inspiration will be given you whereby you will be able to separate the true from the false and the good from the bad. You must not because of the latter discard the former—to have the genuine is a certainty because of the counterfeit and back of all is the light of certainty and truth—And your loved ones call to you from the corridors of heaven to come higher into the divine light and love of the overruling principle, God"—(I give the letter with *punctuation and spelling literatim et verbatim.*)

All this is intelligible enough, with "glittering generalities" galore! One is compelled to admire the adroitness with which the pith and point of my question is evaded and avoided. The reason why *she* should avoid answering the question regarding mediumistic fraud is not far to seek! My uncle would never in the world have addressed me as "My Dear." He was not a sentimental uncle.

The second question was: "Dear Mary:—My Dear Sister:—If you live beyond death, and remember and are conscious, tell me how you died, with what trouble or disease? Lovingly, Stanley." Reply: "Dear Brother. You wonder if I live beyond the great change Death, and if I have the same conscious identity and retain remembrance of the occurrences of earth. Yes Brother I do live in a bright immortal sphere and have perfect consciousness of my earthly career, though through the all wise ordination of God we more perfectly remember the pleasant experiences of our life here"—"gradually outgrowing all error as we progress on to higher understanding in the higher life—but least of all to memory—is the occurrence or occasion of passing from life to life immortal—all suffering—or remembrance fades from view—the last comes like sweet refreshing sleep—and we open our eyes in the higher world with an awakening of what has transpired. More I should love to say to you brother but I find my powers of expression limited upon this occasion. I will [words run together] come to you again and often and as you grow in receptivity of the spiritual come to you inspirationally through your own powers and help you to solve the great problems to a greater extent than is possible through other forces. Write again and with much love. You affectionate sister, Mary."

Again we are overwhelmed with the voluble and tortuous loquacity which seems to be saying something but really says nothing TO THE POINT, but worms around that point with serpentine sinuosity, especially in view of the notorious fact that thousands of "spirits" through other mediums say they *do* remember just exactly how they died, and describe the affair



in detail. In plain language somebody's "spirits" are living! And I am strongly inclined to believe that had Miss B. the Second known just exactly how "Mary" had died a direct answer would have been given, and this general principle of forgetting the bitter experiences of life would not have been introduced! My third question was: "My Dear Jack:—Do you still smoke in the Spiritual world as you thought and argued you would? Staunchly, Krebs." Reply: "My Good Friend and Comrade greetings to you to day from the eternal worlds that I now inhabit." (Ah! poor Jack! How can he inhabit the "eternal worlds" when he never existed here? I wrote to a fictitious personage by the august name of "Jack" simply and purely as a test 1. Either of Miss B.'s reputed telepathic powers, expecting her to discover in the course of a two hours' sitting (if she really possessed such powers) that I had tricked her; or 2, of the "spirit guide's" supernormal powers. This reply proves beyond a peradventure that it is just as easy at the Bangs' seances to get a "spirit message" from the mere idea of a non-existent creature as from one that possessed the fundamental attribute of existence—for messages from each and both are spun out of the fertile imagination of Miss B. But let us hear what this hypothetical Jack has to say further)—"I have found the other world all that my fondest hopes had painted" (Sic!) "some things different of course for it is impossible mind clothed with the tenements of the human body to conceive of the spiritual grandeur beyond. Everything of earth is reflected to the spiritual but far more grand and beautiful. We labor there"—(should *he* not have said "*here*"?)—"but our labors are of love and readily performed. But I have found the spiritual philosophy true—and I gladly return in these few lines of evidence thereof."—(God save the evidence of "Jack"!)"—"I shall gladly come to you again and often"—(He must have communicated with "Mary," for he repeats her very words!)"—"each time finding greater ease in manifesting—for I have found that the spirit immortal as well as embodied must learn the lesson of return

through experience. With the old time friendship. Yours, Jack." (Bless his dear old soul! What marvelous memories this gossamer Jack must have of that "old time friendship"!)

But not a word about "smoking"! Sic! Verbum sat!

This "Jack" episode reminds me of Dr. Parkyn's "Lobus Spigelii." Dr. Parker had addressed his letter to Signor Lobus Spigelii, and had asked whether he remembered how he had cut him when students at college. And here is Signor Lobus' reply in full:—"My Friend of earth—I never expected to return to you thus—but times and the changes it brings"—(this is the "spirit's" grammar, not *Parkyn's*)—"is a good teacher. I have learned the lessons of life and true living and am only too glad for an opportunity to return in proof of this to you—never mind the past, Doc. I entertained no ill feeling at the time of your interferences—You did just right—no apology is required—forget it and believe me still your old time friend and comrade"—(How strangely similar to my "Jack's" affectionate form of address!)"—"I have passed into a world of sublime knowledge and pleasures and sometime we shall again stand as equals on its bright shining shores—Yours kindly L. S."

Imagine the sublimated "spirit" of the human liver (*lobus spigelii*) thus philosophizing! Miss B. actually thought *Spigelii* was a Spanish gentleman!

My fourth and last question was:—"My Dear Mr. Yonkers:—If your purported communications to me at Lancaster, Pa., are true and genuine, for the purpose of convincing me of the marvelous truth of Spiritualism, if true it be, repeat one or two of those communications to-day. Sincerely yours, Stanley L. Krebs."

The reply was, zero! nil! nothing! blank letter paper!

Here the ingenuity even of a Bangs failed! The venture to guess so small a request as but one of those happenings would be risking too much and inasmuch as the question could not be answered in universal generalities, such as those preceding, the only course left was not to attempt any answer at all. Discreet silence indeed!

Let me now call attention to a conspicuous point. "Uncle Will" and "Mary" were actual persons, deceased at the time of the seance, and granting for the sake of argument, that these messages actually did emanate from their surviving consciousness, THEY CONTAINED ABSOLUTELY NOTHING CHARACTERISTIC OR EVIDENTIAL IN THOUGHT, STATEMENT OR STYLE. Mr. J. E. Williams of Streator, Ill., bears similar testimony anent the characterless messages received through the Bangs' mediumship. The fact has often been noted. Dr. Flower says:—"Accepting this message as genuine, there is a phrase in it which shows me either that my old friend Moody"—(He had just received a message purporting to come from W. S. Moody)—"is greatly changed or else that the 'guide' did most of the phrasing. He says, 'I am with you, my dear one.' 'My dear one' is an expression my old friend Moody would have gone a long way to avoid. He was a man who utterly loathed any expression of emotion." (Ditto my uncle "Will")

Many "experienced" readers and Spiritualists may here feel disposed to controvert the above argument tending to prove fraud by pointing triumphantly to their experience where they received AT THE FIRST SEANCE WITH MEDIUMS facts regarding their own or other's lives known ONLY TO THE SITTER and unknown to the medium. True, experiences like this come to the unsuspecting and to those who for one reason or another *want* to believe in the Spiritualistic hypothesis, as a powerful proof of genuineness and supernaturalism.

But these people either *do not know*, or else deliberately *will not believe*, or take into consideration the fact that mediums have

#### A NEWS EXCHANGE SYSTEM,

Frequently referred to as "the underground system," by which information regarding their patrons or visitors is *sent from one to the other*. Mr. J. Clegg Wright, a leading Spiritualistic light and lecturer told me in a private talk, August 9, 1898, at 10:30 A.M., that mediums had an organization among themselves for the purpose of exchanging lists of names

and facts regarding these persons gleaned at seances in various ways. He ought to know what he is talking about, and I certainly believe he does. He would have no purpose but the simple truth in telling me. His wide experience as a Spiritualist and exceptional opportunities, conspire to make his statement authoritative. He earnestly and deeply deplored the very large per cent. of fraud and imposture prevailing among mediums.

Here is the way Mr. A. B. Coonley, editor of *Herald of Light*, San Diego, Cal., describes this secret organization of mediums, which he says, has spread all over the United States with headquarters in Chicago. He held up a "test-book" from which he read several striking "tests," and then said: "A medium in Chicago might come to San Francisco. Here he would get a book for San Jose, where he might exchange it for one in Stockton, etc. There are hundreds of these books and they are exchanged from one medium to another. After a person's name in these books all his or her friends in spirit life appeared, giving relationship, when they passed out, how, and under the head of "remarks" all the striking incidents in the person's past would be given, closing with, "All the mediums tell him or her" thus and so. These data are secured in various ways. Sometimes it is obtained from the person in unguarded moments at a seance, or in conversation; but more often it is secretly captured from the conversation of some loquacious neighbor, friend or relative who is in possession of the facts. "Wonderful" tests are often given in this way."\*

"These vampires are far better organized to-day than Spiritualists, and into secret societies," writes Dr. T. Wilkins.

I myself saw the agents and business managers of slate-writing mediums, trumpet mediums, etc., carefully and daily consult hotel registers at a Spiritualistic camp-meeting, loaf

\* Dr. Richard Hodgson, the honorable secretary of the American Branch of the Society for Physical Research, long ago referred to the existence of this organized gang of professional frauds "Nearly all professional mediums form a gang of vulgar tricksters," he says, "who are more or less in league with one another."

around where the people congregated listening to what they said, engaging them in conversation about themselves or friends, and gleaned facts in various ways from the unsuspecting. Mr. E. W. Wallis, a prominent lecturer, sadly deplored the immense amount of fraud of this kind existing. (See "Light." Ap. 15, 1899.)

With all these facts in mind, I repeat my conclusion stated once or several times before, namely, that the whole affair at the Bangs' sisters *was deliberate and outrageous fraud from beginning to end*. If the percentage of fraud and imposture is as high among the 200,000 or 300,000 mediums as leading Spiritualists admit it is, the reader may judge for himself how much of it is going on to delude and degrade the people who, these same authorities say, patronize them by the millions. Even the most intelligent, who know so little about trickery and its possibilities, can be very readily deluded and humbugged.

One thing more. This expose is written not from any personal grudge or malevolence against these two women or their coadjutors; but from the one simple desire to discover and tell the truth, let suffer who may.

#### SUGGESTIONS TO INVESTIGATORS.

1. Always take a looking glass with you.
2. If the table cloth is long, *insist upon having it removed*, or a *short* one in its place.
3. When the medium turns her back, examine the slates.
4. Examine the door between the two rooms. At times they vary this, and a music box takes the place and performs the function of the door. She would rise and go to the box and wind it up for a new tune whenever she wished to exchange a note or letter with her accomplice in the adjacent room, the box being near the door, wall or window, which had the crack or opening for communication.
5. Notice carefully how and when the letter tablets are handled.
6. Remember that her accomplice writes the messages, as her ingenuity suggests or as the "text-book" directs.

#### IV.

### HOSTILITY TO RELIGION A PROOF OF INSANITY.

BY DR. JACOB COOPER.

The belief in a perfect administration of Law is the strongest incentive to right action and the chief safeguard of innocence. For the assurance that virtue will be rewarded and vice punished with equal and exact justice is an efficient encouragement to those who are trying to do right, and a constant terror to those who desire to do wrong. And there are few who are so far advanced in moral culture that they do right habitually for its own sake, and to whom therefore virtue is its own sufficient reward. The best of men are more secure from feeling the restraints which good government furnishes; and the hope of recognition when they do right is a pleasing thought to any whose discipline is not yet complete. But for evil doers there is the necessity of every kind of restraint; since the least relaxation of the law's demands, or of vigilance in its administration, is invariably followed by an increase of crime.

The belief in a Supreme Being who exercises complete supervision over all conduct is therefore the most powerful factor in the culture of human nature. A lawgiver of perfect knowledge, of almighty power, of immaculate holiness, of absolute justice, and therefore possessing both the ability and the purpose to manage the affairs of the world with unswerving equity, is decisive in securing the right views and proper conduct of mankind. And we have a progressive proof of this truth by the grade of perfection in the administration of human law. For in proportion as the law is searching in its vigilance, exact in its rewards of justice, and certain in its execution is it feared by the bad, loved by the good; and, though for different reasons, obeyed by both. This symptomatic

movement toward perfect administration shows us what would be the effect if this desideratum could be realized. If every man could be assured that his conduct—not merely his overt acts, but his words, his thoughts, and even his desires would be rewarded exactly according to their deserts, and hence there was no way of escape from their consequences, this would be the complete safeguard for the individual in his own private conduct, and the bulwark of society, by punishing crime, or removing the criminal from the place where he could annoy his fellow-man. The conception of such a Lawgiver, if true, would have an elevating effect alike on the individual character and public morals. So far as this idea prevailed it would tend continually to the betterment of the world though it had no Divine warrant. Let us admit that such a conception could be realized among men; that there was such a reign of reason that all the integrating forces of society could be united under one system, and this so perfect that it brought the best men forward to rule; that this salutary constitution continued through self-perpetuation until there was the realization of a perfect righteousness in the expression of the legal code, and this had brought its legitimate fruit in producing a being of such wisdom that he would invariably discern what was right both in his own conduct and that of all others; and he, by the common consent of all good men be invested with authority and power sufficient for the execution of the law: would not this be that for which the enlightened consciences of all men are striving? Suppose this could be evolved by human genius from the principles of wisdom and righteousness which obtain to some degree among men, and seem to have unlimited adaptation for combining and unified action; no one can deny that such a system of law if so devised and executed would be the greatest boon which could be conferred upon human nature.

Now this is precisely what the revelation in the Holy Scriptures, purporting to be the will and purpose of God, claims; and what it actually effects so far as men will put themselves under its guidance. But is that law perfect in its beginnings?



The proper question to ask is whether it is adapted to the progress of the race by an evident increase in clearness and reach as men become capable of such advancement. Childhood which is an epitome of the early races must have a system of law suited to its ignorance and lack of culture. When the creature thinks as a child and acts accordingly it must be treated as a child. Hence the code which is really adapted to human nature must be progressive in its requirements; and while not varying in the essential doctrines of its morality, must in its grasp and reach be revealed to the child or race as they are able to receive it. This is the character of the Divine Law revealed to men. The Legation of Moses is perfect when considered as the rule of action for a rude people which had been brutalized by oppression, but was now rejoicing in the new found license of an escape from a galling slavery. It is incomparably more perfect than any code devised by the wisest nations, ancient or modern. Its defects, when compared with a perfect standard, show a necessary toning down to meet the condition of an uncultured people, but capable of expansion and adaptation to the wants of the most advanced society. It professes to be rudimentary and introductory; having its completion in a new Revelation which shall be given as soon as its subjects are able to comprehend its sanctions and fulfil its demands. That promise is fulfilled in the morality of the New Testament; summarily and particularly in the Sermon on the Mount. Here we have an authoritative declaration by Him who is the source of eternal and unchangeable morality, on which all codes of human law are founded, and to which they must conform so far as they are of any value. There is here enunciated a system of law which is to be planted like leaven in the heart of humanity; and as it extends outwards it so works as to direct and control every energy of the physical organs, every power of the intellect, and every secret impulse of the will. Hence, if fully obeyed it would bring about a complete harmony between the several parts of human nature, would silence every discord between a man and his fellow; and would

bring his conduct into entire conformity with that Power which rules the universe. Thus would be accomplished the utmost desiderata of human life; whether this be considered as a thing complete in itself, or as a preparatory stage to a higher existence. The adaptation for the one is as true and complete as for the other; and hence they may be considered as existing conjointly, or as wholly independent of each other so far as their effect on the character and destiny of man is concerned. But each gives support to the other when considered as complements. For then they open up to us a wider sphere of action, and are seen as parts of a vast scheme which requires an indefinitely long time for its perfect realization. History consists of sections of a circle which embraces the destiny of the human race. The processes of nature, whether physical or metaphysical, require a long period for their development. However perfect a small arc of a circle, or stone in a diadem, petal in a flower, or bone in a skeleton, may be, it can display its perfection only when seen in connection with all the rest. Inconceivably long periods are required by the geologist for shaping the earth's crust. Civilization seems to move slowly while corruptions in social life make a stubborn fight. But more rapid progress is made in culture and morality than in granite or carboniferous strata. All law, no matter whence its source, is seen in its complete effects when viewed in its influence upon character as a disciplinary process working slowly toward a higher development. And it is worthy of careful thought that the most perfect as well as the most rudimentary law is prospective; looking forward to a more advanced stage, a higher life for its complete realization. Exactly in proportion to the advance in culture, so far as this insures right thinking and moral action, do we find the growing light of a dawning Immortality as the goal toward which all striving is directed.

It is indeed often said by the opponents of a direct Revelation that the advance in morality is an evolution of immanent forces, and therefore man has the ability for his own renova-

tion. Claims are made for various systems of morality; such as those of Con-fut-see, Buddha, Solon, the Twelve Tables—that these contain substantially the truths of the Mosaic and Christian codes. While no one except such as are needlessly ignorant or maliciously hostile would make such a claim, yet even if this were true, it would not change the facts for which we contend. Doubtless the law of God is written on the heart of man. It is not likely that the Father of All would leave his children wholly without intimations of His will. Hence we accept the statement as grounded alike on the highest reason as well as Revelation that the consciences of men excuse or accuse; and are a living witness for God's law in the heart of every rational creature; a witness so clear, so authoritative in its demands, that if obeyed it would make all the world supremely happy.\* But it is simply absurd to maintain that any code which is confessedly of human origin can compare with that revealed in the legation of Moses and the words of Jesus Christ. Modern systems of law, not merely such as derive their inspiration from the code of Justinian, but all others enacted by civilized nations, are founded directly upon the revelation of the Bible. Those peoples who are guided by its precepts are the ones who are making progress, and show themselves able to direct the thought and actions of the world. The best of the other systems showed themselves incapable of promoting, and especially of leading the morality of all mankind. They were local in their conception, and not adapted for world forces. Hence culture and morality became stationary under their lead; and so far as they exerted any influence this was formal and superficial. Their outcome where prevailing longest is a witness of their inefficiency to regenerate human nature. As far as they have had an influence for good they are welcomed by every philanthropist, and their aid to Christianity gladly accepted. But their work always remained rudimentary; showing incapacity for evolution and expansion. They furnished discipline for the childhood of the world

\* Butler's Sermons, Vol. II., 19, Gladstone's edition.

but could not suffice for the full-grown man where natural progress has developed through their aid. Hence the attempt to preach a Moslem or Buddhist crusade to supersede Christianity is an absurdity which convicts itself by the testimony of its results where tried most effectively.

It may be said that the morality of this Revelation has failed to effect a complete renovation of man's character. Doubtless there are innumerable vices connected with the highest types of man's progress even under the direction of Divine Revelation. The devoted believer in this will be the readiest to accept that criticism whether applied to society at large or to his individual life. But who is to blame for this unsatisfactory result? Is it the law which commands, and whose sanctions extend not merely to the outward conduct, but to the thoughts and intents of the heart? This law is perfect, converting the soul so far as the free and responsible individual action will permit it to apply. It does all it professes where allowed to act but cannot be held accountable where it is rejected. No responsible creature can be compelled to be good. And if he could be forced to do right, this rightness belongs not to him but to the constraining Power which compels him to that course of action. Virtue is necessarily a voluntary thing, and hence the law can be either obeyed or transgressed. There is nothing in which Infidelity shows itself more irrational than in charging Christianity with the evils which it tries to cure, and with the offences which it condemns; and for which both in the physical and moral nature of man it has provided an inevitable punishment.

The whole aim and tendency of Revealed religion is salutary, and gives proof of its genuineness by the cure which follows its application. The test of a medicine's virtue is seen when it is properly administered. If it always relieves when applied, and just so far as applied proves a panacea, then it carries its own voucher against all opposition. As it would be folly to charge the death of a patient to a medicine that was not taken; so it is quite as irrational to say that the religion of the Bible

does not renovate the world. For the world at large does not take the remedy. Aristotle tells us\* that the art of medicine does not cure the universal man, but the particular Socrates. The individual man must take the remedy and be cured individually. And when each one tries it in the way it specifies and finds that it effects exactly what it promised, and to the extent of its application, this answers all cavils and establishes every claim. Each man knows for himself that, as he obeys the Divine law, he has the testimony in every part of his nature, bodily and spiritual; that he is better and therefore happier; stronger physically and mentally, and therefore more capable of doing good work, and for a longer period. There is then a voucher, and one as complete as could be granted, for the period of man's life upon earth. This, however, is but a section of his existence, yet so far as the arc can be observed the trend is undeviating. And if to this be added that this arc is a part of a boundless circle, a minute portion of an infinite system wherein the same influence will continue to prevail, there can be only one result from the acceptance of such a view and of making it the rule of life and the ground of hope. Men naturally desire happiness. This being that after which all are in quest, the prolongation without limit must be the end to which reason incessantly impels. And if to this there be added the complete elimination of misery, and the perfect evolution of all our powers, and their enlarged fruition, by an introduction to a higher sphere of action exactly in proportion to their growing fitness—surely this picture appeals to our reason and satisfies our utmost desires. And this is precisely what Revealed Religion promises, and which it effects to the extent of its application.

But as this life considered spiritually is only a part of a system or scheme which requires time for its realization, we should not expect the matured fruits at once. The analogy with the things of our experience or of scientific prescience, would require a vast extent for working out the full results.

\* Met. B. I. 6, *ὅτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ἐγιάζει δ' ἰατρῶν κ. τ. λ.*

The utmost that we can demand of any part of a scheme which is of unlimited reach is tendency. And this may be seen in every application of the moral law, whether with reference to its result in man's physical or spiritual constitution. The effect is wholesome and restorative so far as we can follow its action and its responsible subject will permit it to have its legitimate influence upon him. This fact is to be considered in its essential and persistent tendency, not in the case where it is thwarted by the rebellious spirit manifest everywhere, or the ignorance inseparable from the limitations of a finite nature. There are evils in the world, deep seated in their roots and portentous in their results, which try the faith of the docile and arouse the rebellion of the obstinate. The world is so full of misery, there are so many innocent who suffer, seemingly as much as the guilty, that those who look only on one side of existence allow themselves to be driven into pessimism. But a calm survey of human actions and experience will demonstrate that the greater part of the misery, in the case of each person who has arrived at years of responsibility, is self-wrought; and that of such as have done no wrong themselves can be traced back to those who, as parents, were under peculiar obligations to avoid wrong-doing, if not for their own sake yet for those who would inherit their destiny in part through them. Hence instead of traduction being an unreasonable element in a moral system it is an efficient proof of sagacity and mercy. For it is a far stronger incentive to any right-thinking person to feel that he can transmit happiness or misery to others, and especially to his children, than that the consequences of his actions should rest solely upon himself. Altruism is a test of elevation in character, and measures the evolution of human nature. It is felt even by the lower animals so strongly that the majority of them will adventure their lives for their offspring; and is made the symbol of Divine compassion by Him\* who knew not only what is in man but in the entire creation. This sentiment increases in extension

\* Luke xiii. 34.



and depth in proportion to the elevation of character until it becomes in its reach as wide as the world, so that all are our neighbors. Moreover parental affection transfigures human nature changing it into the Divine, where God is revealed to us as the universal Father. In this view the fact that our offences may be the cause of suffering to the innocent who derive their existence from us, or in any way are affected by our conduct, becomes one of the greatest factors in the moral culture of the world. And, therefore, instead of being an argument for a pessimistic view becomes one of the most drastic proofs of a righteous and merciful government of the world. For here the moral and physical laws being counterparts of each other, both show that this government is preventive and salutary by working through every subjective power and external influence which can affect a free and accountable creature.

So whatever line of thought we follow up, the argument converges to the view that the government of the world is intended to secure the happiness of every creature and its continuous development as far as we can trace its action. This government becomes increasingly clear as men through moral culture are prepared to obey it from rational motives, and hence gradually cease to need the restraints of punishment to compel them to do their duty. And here, by the principle of persistent tendency, we are justified from a rational view, as well as a literally revealed system of government, in asserting that perfect obedience would render punitive justice\* unnecessary and obsolete.

If there is this gradual approach toward a perfect obedience to the Divine law, which is surely possible for a free and responsible being, then it becomes plain that punishment for sin, or misery in any form as a consequence of wrong-doing, is not desired by the Governor of the world for its own sake. For as far as the responsible being does right he receives a reward while he moves along his appointed way; and as far as he

\* Perfect love casteth out fear. I. John, iv, 18.



abandons wrong-doing he has self-evidencing proof in his bettered condition that his own voluntary offences, or those of some one whose relation to him affected his destiny, are the sole causes of his misery. Here then is the double proof that the purpose of the Divine Lawgiver was the happiness of this creature, and that misery was no part of the scheme as originally provided for, but a necessary result of the abused power of free choice. For had this choice been so exercised as to avoid wrong-doing—and unless this act was voluntary it had no moral quality—there would have been no misery among rational creatures. And the counterpart of this shows the same truth. For the tendency of the moral law in securing obedience by which man shall be brought into perfect conformity to the will of his Creator, is to eliminate evil wholly, and reintroduce a state of perfect self-perpetuating, and, therefore, unending, happiness.

Such is the design of the Divine law as disclosed in reason; and the whole burden of the Gospel message as enunciated in Revelation. Both disclose a bettered condition in human nature as far as they are permitted to work, and thus exhibit their tendency. Their ordinances are preventive by explicit declaration and warning; they are self-executing and punitive from the moment they are transgressed; they are forgiving and restorative wherever they are recognized as just and authoritative. Then repentance and obedience begin reparation as soon as there is amendment, and continue this process without limitation. Here we have all the conditions of a perfect government. Express declarations and warning in advance; punishment certain and irresistible when transgressed; forgiveness and restoration when wrong-doing has been abandoned. There is a Lawgiver whose whole desire is the happiness of His creatures; and which is secured to the extent that they are willing to obey a law which is formulated according to the unchanging principles of morality, operating as universally and infallibly as the other laws of nature which constitute the entire system of things. It would seem that such a method of government, and

administered by such a Lawgiver, as it is adapted to secure the happiness of every rational creature, would be universally accepted. For there can be no objection to any part of the system when viewed in connection with the whole. There can be no complaint of injustice, since the constitution of the agent works out its own reward or punishment in exact accordance with the responsible and untrammelled determination of the actor. Hence it is impossible to conceive of any system of government more perfect. All codes of human law are founded upon it but fail to reach its excellence. They have their warrant by virtue of a partial correspondence; and will have their consummation when in the development of human nature they can adapt themselves to the exemplar revealed in the conscience and corroborated by the direct message from the High Court of Heaven.

The most irrational act conceivable is that hostility which leads men to reject such a system of government as this. That any rational creature should rebel against a method devised by infinite wisdom to secure his happiness is marvellous; and proves that here he does not employ his reason. His nature must have become perverted before he can reject that law whose influence upon him is only salutary. How can we account for the hostility of any one even wholly selfish, to that which is adapted to secure his highest development in every part of his nature? But the world is hostile to God. It tramples His law under foot and treats his warning with contempt. There is nothing in the universe that a bad man hates so rancorously as God who made him, and the Saviour who would restore him to the happiness which he has lost by voluntary transgression. What explanation can we discover for this monstrous conduct?

It is insanity. The bad man has lost his reason, else he would not hate his greatest Benefactor, and cleave to that which works his inevitable destruction. The first symptom of insanity among men is that they become suspicious of those who are the nearest of kin, and therefore likely to be their greatest benefactors. The tendency to suicide is one of the

most prevalent marks of a disordered intellect. For there is nothing so dear as life to the man of sound mind and healthy body. Life is *per se* so sweet that it is chosen even when burdened with innumerable ills. Death is in all the languages of earth so emphatically "the king of terrors" that "all which a man hath will he give for his life." Hence when a man shows a disposition to harm himself, and reach the culmination by self-destruction, it is evidence that his reason is wholly perverted. Can it be that he seeks to better a condition which seems so intolerable that he cannot submit to its thrall any longer? But how can he expect to better himself by playing the coward and thus showing himself unable to cope with the conditions in which destiny has placed him? Can he hope by further disobedience to atone for the sins which have either directly by his own conduct, or indirectly by that of others, been the cause of his present misery? For if there be a Governor of the universe who controls his destiny this certainly cannot be improved by leaving his post of duty and deserting to the enemy. He is under some kind of government; and unless stronger than the powers which sway the world he cannot escape the consequences of his own conduct by a final act, more disobedient than any other heretofore because it prevents the possibility of any improved action. Unless then the suicide believes himself stronger than the government which controls the world he assuredly will not take the life which has been given him to hold and to keep until it is demanded back from him. And if he does think himself superior he certainly is demented. But it is also an indubitable mark of insanity when a man becomes suspicious of those who love him most, and are his constant benefactors. The unfortunate creature lives in perpetual dread of those whose only object is to do him good. He desires to escape from their presence and feels their solicitude an insupportable burden. Their kindest acts are construed into hostility, and often their life as well as his own pay the penalty of his perverted intellect. These are the proofs most conspicuous in determining a case of insanity; and the

civil code as the highest expression of human wisdom accepts them as decisive. For *felo de se* is regarded in the legal practice of all civilized countries as a conclusive evidence of lunacy. Hence no contract whose validity could be affected by self-destruction is enforced by the law. This has been decided so often against the contention of Life Assurance—which always introduces a *cavéat* making the policy void by suicide—that there is no longer an attempt made to escape payment when the assured takes his own life. Moreover, the constant effort made in the practice of criminal law to show that unnatural crimes against benefactors are the result of insanity, prove that this is an incontestable principle of law, that he who attempts to harm those who have especial claims on his love is thereby shown to be no longer rational.

On what grounds can a rational man oppose that which purports to be the revealed will of God, when this message is *per se* both salutary and restorative? There should be some adequate reason for this hostility, which is general, deep seated, and violent. If an inhabitant from another world were to come here, and discover the general attitude of our race toward the system of religion which claims to be divine, and is evidently salutary, he would be amazed at the spectacle even before he studied the system itself. But let him begin to study the condition among men, and the causes which have brought it about. He would discover that this is in itself a beautiful world, producing everything adapted to please the senses and satisfy the rational desires. Farther investigation would disclose the hidden forces of the earth, and show that they are absolutely unlimited: waiting for and challenging the genius of men to develop and utilize them. For the creature man, the coryphaeus of all temporal things, is given possession in fee simple of the entire earth with its unlimited resources ever ready to hearken to his intelligent bidding. Such is the fecundity of the earth and the elements which surround it, that for an amount of exertion merely sufficient to keep him in the best bodily health, he can command all this immeasurable wealth

of beauty, resource, and power. He is put in absolute possession of the whole without any cost in the first acquisition, or rent to pay for occupancy. The whole structure is as the lamp of Aladdin; and the owner has a talisman, an open sesame, which admits him to every secret treasury vault of material nature. Then, as to the proprietor himself, with what endowments is he equipped? He is of a dual nature body and spirit, organ and force, which are coördinates so fitted to each other in both sections, that with the most inconceivable intricacy of structure, there is the readiest coöperation and greatest simplicity of action. While the world around him is complicated in structure from the atom to the whole earth, yet it also has the quality of concerted action so that it is the most complete unity. Moreover, the proprietor of the whole earth is dowered with powers commensurate with, and extending beyond, the utmost range of the resources which are offered for his use. For while they are in a sense limited by the extent of the world, his powers are sufficient to survey and align the reaches of all finite space. He is made for happiness, increasing in degree without limit, heir to a destiny which can never end, and at the same time susceptible of an eternal expansion. Ought not such a creature be supremely happy? And yet the stranger from the moment of his arrival would hear little save complaints of a hard destiny. He would find a world full of tears and woe, of sickness and pains. Each man's hand against his neighbor, and each power of the individual arrayed against all the rest. Moreover, he would soon learn that these creatures so highly endowed and put in full possession of the whole earth, are in open rebellion against their Creator and lawful sovereign. They neither acknowledge His authority to govern them, nor are grateful for His rich bounties. For they constantly bemoan their hard lot, declaring life not worth living; and many of them so discontented with their destiny that they voluntarily abandon all the delights of life in the hope of securing a dreamless sleep, or utter annihilation. Here would be new ground for wonder. How have these

creatures become so miserable? Were they made wretched in their first formation? Was their nature such that they could not enjoy the good things spread in profusion around them? Were they placed under a tyrannical ruler who delights in imposing hard or impossible conditions upon them? In answer to such inquiries he would find that the Lawgiver is their Father who loves them better than any earthly parent can love his child. That with infinite wisdom a law has been formulated which is suited exactly to their condition both bodily and spiritual—a perfect code in its conception, which executes itself; and embraces the whole realm of man's nature in space and time. This system of government, perfect in itself, and evolving its capacities precisely as the expanding powers of the subject and his improvement by culture enables him to profit, instead of being accepted with favor and obeyed with alacrity is spurned and cast off: not because it fails to secure happiness but prevents him from destroying himself. For it was so completely adapted to his nature that it warned in advance, began to punish as soon as transgressed; extended to every thought and word, as well as deed, and executed itself. Moreover, it is merciful as long as mercy avails; punishes with reluctance and pardons on the least evidence of contrition for the past and assurance of amendment for the future. And while it provided for a perfect condition on earth, and for the longest possible time that a finite creature partly material could exist, it also disclosed this state as a preparation, a discipline for a higher sphere where all the progress made under such limitations should have a wider field for exercise, and an unlimited period for farther growth.

But this creature, instead of accepting a destiny happy in itself and preparatory to one yet grander, seemed to bend its whole energies toward self-destruction. The body which is the instrument for work on earth is to be weakened by excess; its time of action abridged, and its capacity for enjoyment destroyed prematurely. Would this seem to be rational action towards the Supreme Lawgiver who had created the earth and



placed man as his vice-regent upon it? He shows himself unable to control nature in his own interest because he will not live according to the law of his constitution. For there is a perfect connection between external nature and his own moral and physical character as these came from the hands of their Creator. They are counterparts of each other and their possessor has the power to keep them in harmony, or will their discord by which he becomes inimical both to himself and his environment. And this being his voluntary act he is wholly responsible for his misery. He forsakes the fountain of life which flows with pure water so long as he remains in concord with that law which is objectively the code of the Supreme Intelligence, and subjectively the constitution of his own reason. To the denizen of another world who was able to comprehend the relation between the will of a loving Creator, whose only wish for his creatures is supreme happiness, and the desire of every intelligent being and the universe to be happy, this unnatural condition which man has effected by rebellion can be accounted for only on the ground of his Insanity. For it is self-chosen misery instead of a certain and never-ending happiness. The ordinance of nature requires each part to act according to the environment in which the Maker has placed it and the constitution with which it is endowed. It is obvious that if there be a creation, by whatever process this be brought about, whether through evolution of immanent forces, or the direct act of a transcendent personality, there must be subjection to some law or rule which is necessary to constitute a system. For there can be no creation or development by fortuitous jumble; neither could such a process ever evolve order. But regular action, however brought about, demands subjection to authority. If this subjection be effected through necessary mechanical force, there can be no virtue nor vice and therefore no moral character. In order then to render such a condition possible as we actually find existing, the creature when he has developed sufficient intelligence to be able to perform responsible acts, must vol-



untarily take one course rather than another. This is a cardinal fact which must never be lost sight of in the consideration of man's condition as a subject of moral law, and as an actor capable of making himself happy or miserable. Being put in control of his own destiny, and without such capacity he will not be able to do either right or wrong, he will act rationally, he will be master of himself, provided he chooses that course prepared for him by the supreme law of his nature. If he continues in this, if he chooses to employ the powers with which he is entrusted in coöperation with his environment, which is simply living and acting according to the supreme law, he will act rationally. He will be at peace with himself. He will be in harmony with his surroundings by his own choice. He will obey the law of the universe in which he is placed whether this law be personal or impersonal. And this being the constitution of the universe, a necessary condition of any system by which a world could exist and develop, the inhabitant of another world who, as we have supposed, lives in perfect obedience to his own constitution, when he visits this world and sees man at variance with himself, at cross purposes with his surroundings, and in rebellion against the Supreme Lawgiver will pronounce him insane.

Surely, his voluntary continuance in self-wrought misery and in opposition to the Supreme Ruler whose only desire is the happiness of his creatures cannot be accounted for on any other principle.

This conclusion is inevitable when considered apart from any system of revealed religion as certainly as when viewed from this standpoint. Here natural and revealed religion proclaim exactly the same truth. For each declares that man has voluntarily destroyed himself. He has deliberately abandoned the course appointed him by nature which if followed would insure his highest development and greatest happiness. He can understand the laws of his own constitution and of external nature, and is constantly assured that he can submit himself to their guidance. If he does he will be happy as cer-

tainly as the constancy of nature insures the perpetuity of the material universe.

It is the fashion for those who reject a particular revelation, and perhaps still more such as deny the existence of a personal God, to claim superior wisdom. They profess to be guided in all things by reason. Hence, for them revealed religion is only a tissue of mythical legends suitable to the childhood of this world. But man has outgrown superstition and myths, and now lives under a system of positive knowledge, where nothing is taken for granted but all the result of induction from experiment. The two of the three stages of Comte, the theological when the immature world believed in the immediate supervision of a Supreme Intelligence as the child believes that it has a parent who cares for it by direct interference; and the metaphysical in which the Divine supervision is effected by spiritual powers acting through secondary causes, which while no less actual are removed from sense-perception,—have both become obsolete and no longer to be recognized. The third, or positive stage, when all depends upon knowledge gained through experiments on material nature, is now the ruling principle and the only one admitted by reason. We are willing to accept the theory of the *philosophie positive*, and make it the basis of our present argument. Let it be then from direct experiment growing out of man's condition and the laws of nature under which he is compelled to live. Man is under *some* law; and our purpose is to show how he must live so as to best meet its requisitions.

We remark in passing that this claim to superior knowledge is not new. The confidence of knowledge however is in inverse proportion to its amount; but the confidence of ignorance is direct. Those who know nothing cannot be aware of the extent of their ignorance; and those whose intellect is perverted are more confident than those who are in their senses because they are deaf to any proof, and therefore cannot see their error. Such is the state of doubt and unbelief. These profess superior wisdom and candor; and being wrapped up in

the armor of self-sufficiency are impervious to conviction from the clearest evidence. Man's moral character cannot be molded by a law that compels him to act. But his physical being is under the constant control of an immutable code which he must obey, or at once encompass his own ruin. The laws of material nature are exact, comprehensive and infallible in their action. To try to believe that a uniform system of physical law could have generated itself without a directing intelligence is as great a vagary as ever tormented the occupant of a mad house. But to admit that there is a reign of law in the material world, and no superintending intelligence in the intellectual and moral realm, is, if possible, a stronger proof of madness. For the moral and intellectual nature of man is infinitely more grand than the physical.\* It exercises control over every part of the world, extending its sway progressively with the growth of intelligence apparently without end. And herein is a proof of this superiority. Physical nature is a thing complete in itself, with no accretion of power. For it is quite as true that no new energy is evolved as that no power has been lost. But moral character and growth in intelligence are inevitable creations. The increment which the individual soul gains by voluntary action, by purposive development of its original powers, is the production of something where nothing previously existed. But to hold that a spiritual factor of such capacity for action and capabilities for development is not subject to the universal law of conservation, and that its actions will not leave their permanent impression on the universe, argues a perverted reason; an insanity compared with which other forms of madness are mild.

The purpose of all forms of religion is to bring back man to that harmony which existed among his powers by creation, and coördinate him again with his environment and the moral law formulated for his government. This is to be "bound

\* "Man the Thinking"; read Pascal *Parasées*: *L'homme n'est qu'un roseau le plus faible de la nature, mais c'est un roseau pensant.* 1. XII. Fongère.

again," the ties are to be renewed, and the bonds drawn yet closer by which man shall again occupy his true relation to the universe. Physical nature being under the law of necessity has never transgressed. The spiritual nature of man being endowed with freedom and consequent responsibility possesses the power of disobedience. By an unaccountable madness this freedom was exercised in transgression, in rebellion against lawful and salutary authority by which the offender effected his own ruin. He mars the beauty of his own moral nature. He perverts the material world to his own destruction. He considers his Creator as his enemy, and expends all his powers in open but impotent hostility against the Supreme Ruler. One of two courses is open. Man may be left to reap the fruits of his own sowing, and as a result be miserable forever. The other is that the Creator, who is thereby the Father of his erring child, shall interpose for his deliverance. For it is plain that the wanderer will never voluntarily return, but will stray farther and farther away and thus become increasingly miserable. Whatever is done therefore in the way of reclaiming, is an act of undeserved mercy and goodness. Here is the basis of every "religious" system; "to bind the moral power of man again" to that law of righteousness and holy living wherein happiness exclusively consists. Hence all religions have this in common. The positive philosophy, deism, ethics, profess as their task to bring man back to happiness by inducing him to conform to the laws of his being. This purpose may be expressed equally well in the language of science or revealed religion. For they are, when rightly understood, coördinated and aim at the same result; to bring back and bind the offender again to his gracious Sovereign. The feeling of misery as the result of sin renders some system of religion indispensable. Some sort is accordingly found among all men. There will be different degrees of rationality and adaptation to man's nature corresponding to his intellectual and moral character. This fact, of itself, is an unanswerable argument in favor of a system of religion that becomes increas-

ingly clear and applicable to man's highest good in exact proportion to his development and ability to receive it. The objective truth and the subjective receptivity are counterparts; which show that if man were perfect he would be capable of understanding and practising a perfect system of religion. When the transgressor first returns from wanderings and is re-bound to his Sovereign, then the external and internal law have an exact correspondence and confirm the truth which is the embodiment of both. It is often said by the enemies of all religions that there are defects in them. The condition of savages who are full of superstition and devoted to some form of religion is pointed to as an evidence of the crudity of a supernatural system. Grant that this is true. But their scientific status is equally crude, and they are quite as incapable of availing themselves of the latest results of material progress as of the loftiest truths of revealed religion. The condition of such savages precludes the possibility of their being amenable to a perfect system of truth. Were such proclaimed to them they could neither understand nor practice its requirements. And yet even the lowest form of fetichism, the crudest conception of moral law are better than no religious ideas. For even in them there is a basis for progress. It is possible to teach the lowest savage a higher form of belief and practice. Teaching is a slow process in all cases, and especially the very ignorant. But the entrance of light gives light in the thickest darkness; and the teaching of a more perfect law renders the learner susceptible of constant progress. The enemies of religion point to the fact of the extreme degradation of some savages as an evidence that they are wholly without any ideas of religion. If that were true—which we deny—it would prove no more against the reality of a true religion than their ignorance of the laws of physical science proves that there are no such laws. Moreover, that there should be imperfections in all the systems of religion received among men is to be expected. For we can know but in part so long as our powers are circumscribed. The systems of science are perpetually

developing *pari passu* with man's ability to understand and utilize. So the truths of religion are confessedly revealed to man as he is able to receive them.\* The imperfection of the latter are no more proof against their substantial validity and adaptation to their purpose, than the mistakes and subsequent rectifications in the domain of physical science are conclusive that the latter is baseless. The hostility of scientific men to religion is the most decisive mark of that inconsistency which is an inseparable attendant of insanity. For while the progress of science is the record of the rectification of mistakes, and the application of new truths as fast as men had the power to master them in theory and utilize them in application, there is demanded of religion that all its doctrines be perfect at the beginning, and thoroughly utilized both in theory and practice—a requirement contrary to all human progress. The facts of science exist in nature as an entirety, comprehending the whole realm thereof. So the laws which hold these in their embrace exist and are in active operation from age to age before the senses of men can comprehend them, or even suspect their existence. Thales and Ptolemy saw the same phenomenal nature that Copernicus, Newton, and Laplace explained. But the former neither understood what they saw, nor could have profited by the most rigidly scientific explanation. So Abel saw the sacrifice of a lamb, but did not understand how this prefigured the forgiveness of sins in the sacrifice to be made on the Cross. And the astronomer of future ages will be able to explain part of what was beyond the reach of the author of the *Système du Monde* as the believer of the centuries to come will comprehend, but only in part, that profound mystery "which the angels desired to look into." The demand then of the scientist that the religious system, which involves the moral and intellectual nature of man, must be perfect in itself as enunciated for the use of those who "yet see as in a glass darkly"; while in their own province of exact science, its whole history is advanced by the rectifica-

\* Mark iv. 33.



tion of false theories—is a clear proof that in this respect the scientific enemies of religion are insane.

If there be a personal Creator who has fitted nature together, and there be a "Reign of Law," then man must be embraced as a part thereof. He will therefore, as a responsible being, and in this respect differing from the material creation, have the charge over himself. The material and physical forces obey the universal law of necessity, and have no responsibility for the work; and it in turn has no moral quality. But man is charged with the responsibility of acting according to the law enacted by Infinite Wisdom for his guidance. He is entrusted with the ability to meet the duty, else it could not be required of him. And to conduct himself so that he shall always obey the law of his constitution is to act rationally: that is to keep himself in accord with his nature as a part of the system of the universe. He is entrusted with this duty and with power to do for himself what in the case of other things is done for them. If he fails to do this duty he is more irrational than the brutes which by instinctive knowledge recognize their obligations to their benefactor.\* Nay, they are more senseless than the very stocks and stones which invariably keep to the laws of their structure, displaying beauty and utility, and so fulfil their parts in the order of nature.

But what does a system of religion require that it should cause men to be hostile to it? It certainly requires nothing from the side of God. For He is self-sufficient and needs nothing from His creatures. The act of creation demonstrates His self-sufficiency. For if there is anything that the creature can do for the advantage of his Maker, this was all involved in the power necessary for his creation. One of the greatest proofs of the madness in man is shown by his attitude toward religion.† He seems to think God needs his worship, his love, his fear, or his penitence. Perhaps there is no more insidious temptation

\* Isaiah, i. 3. The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib, etc.,

† Ps. 50.



to folly than is shown in the credit people take for the observances of worship and piety. The professed believer appears to think that he deserves much praise for the regularity and fervency of his devotions. This feeling may glide insensibly into hypocrisy, and then does not belong to our subject further than to say, this is a testimony to the truth, just as a spurious coin gets its fictitious value from a resemblance to the genuine. But the enemy of God shows his madness in two special ways. First, because he acts as though he believed he could injure the Almighty Maker of the Universe, than which nothing could be more insane. But, secondly and chiefly, because he wilfully misrepresents his relations to God. It is of no consequence to God whether a man worship him or not. For He was the same self-sufficient Being before He created the phenomenal universe; and would remain such were all His creatures to rebel against His authority and thereby destroy themselves. This fact is lost sight of by such as array themselves in hostility to religion. For this demands of them nothing for its own sake. It is purely beneficent. It gives all: it receives nothing. When it calls on man for obedience to the laws of God this is because they are the laws of His being, and the only conditions of his grandest development and highest happiness. To obey these laws is indispensable to his well being. To disobey, certain ruin. These would seem to be sufficient reasons to secure obedience and love. For God is displayed to man in His works and in His law, as the closest and most powerful friend; who desires his confidence, obedience, and love not for selfish reasons, but of pure benevolence. Hence it matters nothing to God but everything to man whether he obey the Divine commands. And these commands are not grievous. They are all in the line of his highest development in every factor of mind and body. Obedience to these commands is life, growth, a constant ascent to a higher destiny. Disobedience is degradation, misery, and ending in irremediable ruin. Thus, from every point of view hostility to religion is a proof of man's insanity. For just as in the relations of men to each other

those who are the greatest benefactors are most loved by such as are in their senses; so when the intellect is perverted everything is reversed. The dearest earthly friend is thought to be the bitterest enemy; and is either avoided or sought only to be injured. So the universal Father "in whom," as the prophet of their own has said,\* "we live and move and have our being." The Creator and constant benefactor who needs nothing from us, but asks love and obedience for our own sakes, is the object of our bitterest hostility, is dishonored, neglected, blasphemed; is fled from as far as man can escape from his presence. Here is madness itself: showing hostility without grounds and leading to a ruin without remedy. Man is his own enemy by the commission of any sin; and he escapes from the only hope of deliverance by departing from his loving Father, who by a religion revealed in the conscience and corroborated in the written Word, "would have all men to be saved" by returning to the knowledge of the truth.

It has been the object throughout this discussion to prove the reasonableness of religion by showing that every expression thereof is merely the renewal of the Law of Nature as found in the material and spiritual world so far as combined in the constitution of man. It is not attempted to prove that any system which has ever been promulgated is faultless; though we asseverate that the Gospel of Jesus Christ enunciated in words and exemplified in his life, even by the admission of his most hostile critics—is perfect. The purpose has been to show that the exclusive aim of religion is to restore man to the state which is his by nature, but has been voluntarily abandoned by transgression. This aim is more or less perfectly reached, according as the advance in culture and morality enables the race or the individual to comprehend and apply the message which revelation offers. It is sometimes held that a revelation should make all things plain, and thereby remove all difficulties. But if it explained everything which is recondite in the divine government, this could not be understood without

\* Aratus.

at the same time bestowing the increments of culture and morality which would make man at once equal to all the requirements of personal responsibility, and thus relieve him from the necessity of effort for self culture and the building up of character. This would leave him nothing to do. For it would preclude the exercise of his powers in a disciplinary stage which is undoubtedly the purpose of this life, and complete the work by divine action which can only be done by man himself. Hence it is clear that the teaching of religion must be progressive both in its clearness of enunciation and the reach of its requirements. And we have a perfect analagon to this in the progress of scientific knowledge. Man must himself be the instrument of its growth. Were there to be made a complete revelation of all the laws of the physical universe no intellect but one possessed of omniscience could understand it; and to such a mind no explanation would be necessary. To inferior minds this exposition, however clear in itself, if it be at the same time comprehensive, could not be understood by any mind which had a grasp less than that of him who made the communication. The system of Kepler would have been wholly ignored by Thales or Ptolemy unless with it were given the *setting of knowledge*, so to speak, that is, the coördinate facts and their explanation necessary to enable the scientist of that day to grasp the situation. Thus the demand that revelation be such as to explain all difficulties is proleptic, and involves the completed result for which it places the means in the reach of him who is himself to do the work necessary to a higher stage. If all were made plain by the revealer, he would at the same time have to bestow a sufficient increment in spiritual knowledge to grasp the meaning, with the temper necessary to secure obedience which would involve the completion of the character. But this would thereby render effort and discipline unnecessary in him to whom the revelation is made. The cases of anticipating knowledge in science and morals are so completely analogous that they may be properly called identical, and the insanity of the scientific

opponent of religion is shown in that he requires in the one domain precisely that which he knows would be impossible and absurd in the other.

Finally: In this special subject we may note that insanity in one line of thought is often united with the utmost clearness and sagacity of intellect in all others. Some of the most perplexing questions that ever confront a court of justice arise out of the determination of insanity. The suspected subject shows such shrewdness, such complete mastery over his modes of thought, that he is a match for the sharpest legal examiner, and the tests of the most practiced expert alienist.

Perhaps nothing has ever taxed legal acumen more than the case *De Lunatico Inquirendo*. For the subject can baffle the subtlest inquisitor provided he be taken on any other matter than the special one in which he is insane. There is exhibited an almost superhuman sagacity and grasp, a logical fencing worthy of a Megaric, which is continued until the special topic on which the mind is astray, is reached. But when this is touched like the tail of a Prince Rupert's Drop, the whole mind flies to pieces, and the peer of the wariest lawyer, and the most experienced expert in mental aberration is at once seen to be wholly perverted; so desperately insane that he must be put in a straight-jacket, and placed in a padded cell. Thus it is with the enemies of religion. They understand all that can be known in science in its present stage, of which they are the exponents. They see order, beauty, grandeur in the material universe. They discover the laws according to which the forces of nature act, and can explain the movements of matter with accuracy; can admire the inner structure and outward adaptation of one portion of the world to another. They can see the suitability of means to ends; can explain the operations of nature on the same mathematical and mechanical principles which must be employed when man utilizes the materials and forces to accomplish his purposes. They can discover a reign of law, a constancy and uniformity in the movements of all material things. They can understand human affections

and social laws; can be good citizens and faithful in the home relations. On all these subjects they are sane; as rational as other people, and peers in many of these relations of the professed religionist. But they can see no need of a moral ruler in the universe. While the connection between sin and suffering is as plain as that between physical causes and effects, yet to them this is merely accidental. There must be a human lawgiver in order for a code to be formulated, but no divine ruler to establish the relations of things which renders a code possible. There must be human tribunals to determine what is just, to reward the good and punish the evil so as to conserve a moral order in society. But there can be no court of last resort to rectify the mistakes made by men; no judge of infinite knowledge and compassion, who by his discernment of what is in man, can render infallible justice. And while there are human affections which cannot attain their full play, while there are preparations made for work which never reach their goal, and while the whole of this life is evidently disciplinary, there is no future where the work for which the preparation has been made can be completed. There is an arc without the completed circle; there is a discipline with no arena for the display of the perfected powers; there has been a force of moral character gained never to be used; and there are hopes built on the conservation of energy never to be realized. Religion explains and provides for all this. For we have revelation of a perfect moral law, which becomes increasingly clear as man, by advancing culture, becomes able to receive it; and by its adaptation to his wants is a voucher for its own truth. But though all discords in nature become concords through the correlation of the natural and supernatural revelation, yet hostility to its utterances has so perverted man's mind that he refuses to see the truth; and like the desperately insane beats against the bars which prevent him from destroying himself.

V.

THE PRIORITY OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE BARKER STEVENS, D.D.

The question proposed by Dr. Bowman at the close of his article on "The Teaching of Jesus" (*Reformed Church Review*, January, 1902), in which he kindly reviews my recently published work on the same subject, sounds like a friendly challenge.

The question reads: "Does the increasing value which is placed upon the teaching of Jesus imply that in the teaching of Jesus is embraced all that is necessary to Christian faith and Christian life?"

I should be well content to subscribe, in answer, the words with which he began his article: "The teaching of Jesus must ever be regarded as fundamental and regulative for Christian thought and life. In connection with the person of Jesus it constitutes the foundation of the Christian system."

One may be fairly expected, however, to unfold the import of such a general statement somewhat more fully. To me it covers such points as these: (1) For salvation faith in Jesus Christ is the sole essential. Hence his words and deeds are of primary importance, since through them we know him in whom we believe. Jesus Christ offered himself as the world's true Master and Saviour. To receive, obey and serve Him is the sum of all duty.

(2) But if Jesus is known to us primarily through his own words and deeds, he is secondarily known to us through the words of others. Those who "accompanied with him" have testified about him. Others who were not his immediate associates but who had ample means of knowing about his life and work have given us their interpretations of him. In a word, we could never complete the historical picture of Christ with-

out using the testimonies of others. These testimonies must be critically discriminated. We must know the difference between primary and secondary sources; between primitive apostolic and post-apostolic testimonies, and the like. But the value of these various testimonies is that they help to show us Christ himself.

(3) We might roughly represent to ourselves the significance of the various New Testament books by a series of concentric circles. Jesus is the center. The innermost circle is Jesus' own teaching; beyond that lie the testimonies of the eye and ear witnesses; beyond this the efforts of the earliest Christian teachers to apply Christian truth to their own peculiar problems, and, finally, the latest and most doubtful books. But all have the same center, though not the same value and importance.

(4) This general view centers the revelation of God in a person rather than in books written about him. The books have their value in relation and subordination to him. They have their whole occasion and reason for being *in Him*. Necessary, indeed, are they to us, since our knowledge of Christ is historically conditioned and is conveyed to us through historical channels; but we must not confound means and end, medium and object.

(5) We must clearly distinguish personal trust in Christ from assent to speculative conclusions. One may regard the abstruse, metaphysical statements of the so-called Athanasian creed as correct, but it is false to say that assent to them is necessary to salvation. One may claim if he thinks fit, that he can explain the inner mystery of deity, but to assert that his speculations are essential to salvation is the denial of Christ. There has been in Christendom quite too much of what Mr. R. H. Hutton called "the doctrine of salvation by correct notions of the nature and policy of God."

(6) We must therefore distinguish the province of religious faith from that of speculative, theological thought. The latter may freely range the fields of philosophy and science and



soar away towards the sun (with the probable consequences which befell Icarus), but faith is a humbler, though greater thing—trust in Jesus Christ for salvation from sin. The Hegelian doctrine of the Trinity and the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination are legitimate speculations. They are really samples of two general metaphysical theories, but as respects Christian faith and life, I am not necessarily better if I accept them, nor if I reject them am I the worse.

(7) The increased emphasis which is now given to the teaching of Jesus means simply a return to the standpoint of the New Testament itself, all of whose writers (and most of all Paul himself) unite to proclaim the primacy and sole sufficiency of Christ. Each of them would wish, like John the Baptist, to "decrease" that he might "increase." And highly as we should esteem the great apostle to the nations as a help to our apprehension of Christ, it is he himself who exclaims: "Who is Paul? Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized into the name of Paul?"

I venture these suggestions in partial reply to the friendly challenge. Their adequate presentation would require an article of much greater length, if not a volume. I hope they may serve to indicate my general point of view, and perhaps stimulate others to enter upon a more detailed discussion of the subject to which they refer.

## VI.

### THE AUTHORITY FOR THEOLOGY NOT IN ANTIQUITY.

BY A. E. TRUXAL, D.D.

Theology is a science. There are many sciences. Astronomy, geology, chemistry, biology, physiology, psychology, ethics, history, sociology, and scores of other studies, are sciences. The value of any science depends upon the interest it has for the human family. As a consequence some sciences stand higher in the scale of importance than others. Theology treats of God and His relation to the world, and of man and his relation to God, his fellowman and eternity. Hence it can justly be regarded as the most important and valuable of all the sciences.

A science seeks to know the truth of a given subject. To arrive at a knowledge of this truth requires investigation, comparison of facts, logical study, observation and experience. As a consequence every science is of necessity progressive in its character. It has a beginning and a history. Some sciences are old, others comparatively new. Nearly every age produces one or more sciences that previously had no separate definite existence. The last century brought to view a number of subjects from which new sciences have been developed.

Some sciences date so far back in past history that their origin cannot be definitely stated. Yet their development can be traced through the ages of the modern world. By the modern world is not meant the last three or four hundred years, but that period of time covered by the christian era. All that has come to pass in this period is pretty thoroughly and accurately known. A science comes into existence and is developed in a regular, orderly and natural way. It has a growth. One person devotes himself to the investigation and

study of one department of truth. He acquires a degree and amount of knowledge of it which he publishes to the world. But he is not able, for many and various reasons, to learn all that is to be known of his subject at the time; besides the subject itself may be of a progressive nature, unfolding itself ever more fully as the ages come and go. Others lay hold of the subject, investigate it further, make new discoveries, gain more light, and they modify and change the views and theories of their predecessor. These are followed by other students of the science who having the advantage of the knowledge already acquired and of the larger experience had, employing new modes and using improved appliances, bring the study to an advanced position. And thus the process of revising, correcting and enlarging goes on from age to age and no doubt will go on to the end of time. It comes to pass sometimes that the same views and theories will maintain themselves for many centuries. Then no visible progress is made. The science seems fixed for the time. But a point is again reached when the study of the subject is revived, new theories are advanced, the old ones are modified and perhaps superseded.

The truth of a science is in the first place objective. As such it is all the time perfect. It never changes. The laws of matter, for example, with which chemistry has to do, are forever the same. The laws of the heavenly bodies are unchangeably fixed. The vegetable kingdom as an object for study remains the same. The truth embodied in it is complete. But all these things are not sciences; they constitute external objects which are to become the subjects of sciences. The science is the subjective apprehension of the truth contained in the object. And if any science could apprehend and comprehend fully, thoroughly and completely the truth embodied in the object, then the science would be perfect. The truth of the science would then be commensurate with the truth of the object. That science would then be fixed, and that would be the end of study along that line. But the sciences are never perfect; there is always something yet to

be learned in every department of truth, and in some more is yet unknown than known. And it is a blessed thing for man that this is so. The search after knowledge redounds to man's well being. This condition will in all probability remain throughout eternity. Dr. William B. Brown speaking of the necessity of the revision of human knowledge says: "This same process must go on in the world of departed spirits and among the angels of God. All that finite beings can ever know must be infinitely less than infinite; and, as knowledge increases, revisions of past thoughts must follow."\* At any rate we know very well that in this world the knowledge of no science is yet full and complete. But progress has been made and progress will be made. Revisions of conceptions and theories have been made, and they will continue to be made, and knowledge of the various subjects of study will grow, extensively and intensively, as the truth is ever more fully and accurately apprehended.

Now, then, theology being a science, it must necessarily partake of the same characteristics that belong to any other science. This is something that students of theology and christian believers in general ought never to forget. Theology, conceptions of divine objects, forms of doctrine, theories of religion, confessions of faith, constitute a human science. And this science is subject to the same conditions and limitations by which all other sciences are governed. If some persons were to remember this they would be able to acquire a clearer knowledge of the truth and save their souls much unnecessary vexation. We repeat then, theology is a science, and we must therefore at the outstart distinguish between the object of the science, and the science itself. The science is the subjective apprehension of the truth set before us in and by the object. But here as elsewhere, and more so than elsewhere, the truth has never yet been, nor is it now, completely and perfectly learned. Theology is far from a perfected science. It has had a beginning and has a history running through many centuries.

\* *The Problem of Human Destiny*, p. 23.

But at no point had it reached a state of perfection. Hence it could at no time remain satisfied with itself; it has all the time been seeking after a fuller and correcter knowledge of the truth.

The science of theology treats of God, of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of men, of the Holy Spirit, of the Church, of the sacred Scriptures, and of the way of salvation. These are objectively forever the same. God, His nature and attributes, His disposition and works; Jesus Christ, His nature and mission, the character and purpose of His life and works; the Holy Ghost, His being, province, functions and operations; the Church, her constitution, ordinances and mission; the Scriptures, their source, meaning and use; repentance, faith, hope, love, and the way of salvation in general; all these objects are what they are in themselves, independent of any and all apprehension and understanding of them on the part of man. They are each in itself the embodiment of its truth. But they do not constitute theology. The Bible is not theology, neither the whole nor a part of it. But it is one of the objects to be made subjects of theology. When some one says, "doctrine is derived from the Bible; it contains all the truth, and it changes not. When I have the truth of the Bible, I need nothing more," he shows his lack of ability to discriminate. The Bible does not set forth doctrines and theories, but facts, just as the vegetable kingdom confronts us with realities. Upon these we base our doctrines and from them we evolve our theories. The Bible must be interpreted. The Bible remains the same, but the interpretation changes.\* The same must be said of all the

\* Washington Gladden in *How Much is Left*, says: \* \* \* "the enlargement of our knowledge, and the change of our point of view, lead us to interpret the Bible differently. We do not take the same view of the Bible itself that we once took. We have studied it more carefully, we have gone to the Bible itself to find out what kind of a book it is, and the Bible has plainly told us that it is not the kind of a book that we once thought it to be. It is a better book, a far more useful book, but it is a different book. And therefore, because our view of the book has changed, and our method of interpreting has changed, our doctrines, even in their Biblical elements, must have undergone a considerable change, too."

above objects of investigation and study. They remain unchangeably the same. But theology whose aim and efforts are to understand the truth contained in these great and precious objective realities is never perfect. It is evermore striving to obtain a fuller and more correct knowledge of the truth; and it makes progress, too. The progress, however, as a general rule, is not very rapid. Sometimes it rests content with the position it has reached. During the thousand years, between the sixth and sixteenth centuries, no important changes were made in the formularies of the church and very little change was effected in the theological conceptions of the minds and hearts of believers. But, then, during the century of the Reformation great and far-reaching changes were wrought in a comparatively short period of time. Old doctrines and theories were abandoned, others were revised, and new ones were elaborated and formulated. And yet the conceptions of God and His kingdom and His word in that period were far from accurate and correct. Many changes in theology have since taken place; though not all changes were improvements. But in the main progress in the apprehension of the truth has still taken place. The fact that Martin Luther could hold repeated conversations with the devil, as he imagined, and hurl an inkstand at his head, and could approvingly tolerate the burning of witches by the hundred, and say, "I would burn them all; spare none of them"; and the fact that John Calvin could allow Servetus to be burned at the stake, because he held different theological opinions from those in authority, without crying out against the commission of the enormous crime; and the further fact that the people, high and low, of that age, could willingly and cheerfully take part in the martyrdom of so-called witches and heretics; these facts, we say, show that the deep-seated prevailing conceptions of the truth as represented by the being of God and His kingdom were very different then from those of the present day. Such inhumanities would now be regarded as desperately wicked and would not be tolerated for a single moment; though it must be admitted that a

lingering spirit of the age of religious persecutions still dwells in our midst. Thanks be to God, its demise is near at hand! Nevertheless, many and great changes have taken place in theology. Conceptions and theories must change, and they do change. In the language of a vigorous thinker and clear writer we say "that changes have taken place in old doctrines; that portions of them are obsolete or obsolescent; that in form and content they are different now from what once they were."\* Theology, as well as any other science, has consequently a history. This is set forth and more or less fully and definitely described in the body of church history in general; and is given in an orderly and definite way in the histories of christian doctrines that are produced from time to time. If theology always remained the same, being complete and perfect from the beginning, church history would be reduced to a mere chronicle of annals; and such a thing of a history of doctrines would be impossible.

The Bible in its relation to theology may be viewed under two aspects. In the first place, it constitutes one of the branches of theological study. Then we seek to answer the question, what is the Bible and what its purpose? In that view of the case then the Bible is an end in itself. We do not look through it to something beyond; but we stop with the Bible itself as a subject, and we endeavor to get at the truth of its origin, its nature, its purpose. In this respect the Bible is a very interesting and profitable subject for investigation and study. But in the second place, it occupies a different position in its relation to many other theological subjects. What is that? We want to learn of God and His works of Christ and His salvation, of the christian and his privileges, hopes and duties. A knowledge of these things we get through the instrumentality of God's word in general. We need His word to enlighten us on all these important subjects, and the main leading source from which we may obtain His word is the sacred scriptures. The word of God is embodied in the Bible.

\* Washington Gladden in *How Much is Left*, p. 2.



God speaks to us in one way or another on all the subjects of theology in the Bible. The Bible in this relation becomes the medium and means by and through which divine light is focused upon all the great subjects of theological inquiry. Without the teaching of the Bible we would be left in great darkness, and could not have any theology at all as we now understand the term. In this view it is not the end in itself but a means to other ends.

But God also speaks to us in other ways and through other means. God's word comes to us, too, through nature and through the accomplishments and experiences of mankind as a whole and of men as individuals. "Our doctrines," says Dr. Gladden, "if they are true and complete, are drawn from other sources as well as from the Bible. They are drawn also from our knowledge of ourselves, and of the world in which we live." The natural world is a mouthpiece for God. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night sheweth knowledge." "The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the peoples have seen his glory." "For the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity; that they may be without excuse." If the psalmist and St. Paul could see God and hear His voice in the heavens above and in the visible world around them, surely His voice could be heard by the people in later years, who saw and knew more of the natural world by far than those sacred writers did in their day. The knowledge acquired by the astrology of the Jews was a small matter in comparison with the knowledge of the universe revealed to us by the science of modern astronomy. And the knowledge of the visible things around us in the days of the Apostles is insignificant when compared with the revelations of the sciences of geography, geology and chemistry of later times. Did the firmament in the time of David declare the glory of God, and were the invisible things of God made manifest in the things seen in

the natural world in the days of St. Paul, how much more does the firmament of our day in the light of our knowledge of the laws and motions of the heavenly bodies and of the vast extent of the universe proclaim the character and the greatness of Almighty God, and how much more does earth, sea and sky as revealed to us by modern sciences show the invisible things of God to the christian mind and heart? The natural world speaks louder and more plainly to-day than it ever did before. There is a word of God in nature. Day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night showeth knowledge, and the truth of God is thereby revealed.

Again, God speaks to man also in the history of the world as this unfolds itself from age to age. God is in human history. This is perhaps a trite saying, but it is a question whether the true meaning of it has as yet been fully comprehended. God reveals His truth through the various processes of history. Natural history has been called profane history in order to distinguish it from sacred and ecclesiastical history. We insist upon it, however, that common history is not profane. The firmament on high and the visible world in which we live are not profane; neither is mankind profane. It belongs to the universal kingdom of God, and He uses its history for the accomplishment of His wise and gracious purpose. It is not, indeed, the most holy place in the temple, but it is nevertheless one of the outer porches. The voice of God is in history. His word is revealed through it. The same is true in a higher and fuller sense with respect to church history. The Lord has been in and with His church; He has guided, directed and blessed His people; He has employed His followers for the establishment, development and extension of His Kingdom of grace and salvation in the world. And by what God has done and is doing in and for and by His people He speaks to us. He proclaims His word to us. The Lord God revealed His character and will in the sacred history of the Old Testament and in the Acts of the Apostles, and there is also a revelation of a certain kind to a certain extent of His voice and will in the life and works

of His people in the history of the church. God speaks to us through the unfolding of His Kingdom in the world by the faith and experience of those who seek to do His will. And as God continues to reveal Himself in nature and history from age to age, the body of believers does not remain stationary. Christian consciousness follows in the wake of this external development. As there is an enlargement of the knowledge of the outside world and of man, and hence also of God, so do christian thought and feeling become correspondingly larger, broader, deeper and keener. The Lord is consequently able to speak to the conscience and intuitive reason more largely as time rolls on.

Now then the light and truth that come from all these various sources exert an influence upon theological thought and aid in the formation of conceptions of God and divine things and of religious doctrines in general. Hence the author already quoted says: "As generations pass, and men learn more about themselves and the world in which they live and the works of God in the world, their point of view changes, and their doctrines are modified by their growing knowledge."\* But some one will say "by recognizing these outside sources of divine truth, you rob the Bible of its great value and glory." Not so. We do not rob the sun of its greatness and glory by recognizing the light of the moon and the stars that bestud the skies. By comparison these last but cause the sun to stand forth all the greater in its brightness and beneficence, and they all unite as with one voice in testifying to the power and wisdom and goodness of the divine Creator. So the value of the Bible is enhanced by the recognition of other sources of truth; and the knowledge of the world and mankind as a whole and as individuals aids in the proper understanding of the Bible itself. Now then it is evident from all this that theology must be progressive. The objects of faith appear under different aspects and have a different meaning in different periods of the world. They are viewed in new lights and from different

\* *How Much is Left*, p. 2.

standpoints. Hence conceptions change, theories change and doctrines change. Some are modified by elimination, some by enlargement some are given up and new ones formulated. And the form of a doctrine sometimes remains the same for a long time but the contents are gradually modified and changed, and by and by the form breaks and a new one is given it.\* Consequently the theology of no one period is exactly the same as that of another period. Neither does the theology of one age become the standard for that of all ages. Some persons seem to think that the doctrines of some particular time are authoritative for all time to come. For example Rev. James Chrystal in *Authoritative Christianity* holds that the acts and proceedings of the six ecumenical councils ought to be the guide for the faith and practice of the church ever afterwards, and that the demand upon the church now is to return to the position of those early times. In the same way, with less show of reason, others claim that protestanism ought to hold fast to the theology of the sixteenth century; that our minds and hearts ought to be held under the authority of the confessions of that period. But all such thoughts are utterly impracticable. While some individuals might in a measure force themselves to feel and think and act as the fathers did, the christian public would never respond to such a challenge. Neither will it do to say that non-essentials may be changed, while the essentials remain; for the so-called non-essentials are indicative of the nature and character of the fundamentals. A change in the

\* "We have kept and still repeat the dogmas of early times; but we pour into them unconsciously a new meaning. The terms do not change, but the ideas and their interpretation are renewed with each generation. This is particularly the work of the theologian. We spend our time, consciously or unconsciously, in putting new wine into old bottles. There is not a single dogma dating from two or three centuries back which is repeated with the same meaning as in its origination. We still speak of the inspiration of the prophets and of the Apostles, of atonement, of the Trinity, of the divinity of Christ, of miracles; but, whether in a greater or less degree, we understand them differently from our fathers. \* \* \* There comes a time when the new wine causes the old bottles to break, and when it becomes necessary for the church to make new vessels to receive it." Dr. Sabatier quoted in *How Much is Left*, pp. 4, 5.

one involves also a change in the other. Not backward but forward lies the goal of theology. Its "golden age" cannot be found in the past, but must evermore be sought in the future. The world in all its departments has been moving forward from the beginning of its known history; wonderful strides have been made during the last hundred years. We are living in the midst of a strong onward moving current; and yet there are those who in a spirit of desperation are calling upon the "leaders in the strife" to stop and return to some particular time of the past."\*

This leads us to say further that the truth and accuracy of a doctrine are not determined by its age. A theory may be promulgated and maintained by the church for a long time and still afterwards prove itself unsatisfactory. But it is said, "what is once true is always true." That, however, depends upon our conception of the truth. The truth of the declaration depends on the application that is made of it. As we have before said, objective truth is always the same. But the subjective apprehension of the truth, which is the only truth we have in our possession, and the only truth that we can formulate into doctrines, is not complete, is wanting in some elements, and often has elements of error mixed up with it. The fault lies not with the truth itself but with the minds and hearts of men. The limitations attach to the human apprehension. If any truth were fully and thoroughly grasped and embodied in a doctrine, that doctrine would be true and remain true. There are some general propositions that are always true, such as, there is a God, there is a vegetable kingdom, and

\* Note. If some of our good brethren, who seem to be distrassed by the present trend of theological thought, would honestly read Canon Farrar, Bishop Hort, Professor Fairbairn, Henry Drummond and others of England, and Professors Smythe, Ladd, Briggs, McGiffert, Burney and Gilbert, and Pastors Gladden and Brown, and others of America, they might perhaps be able to break the shell in which they are confined, and come out into the light and liberty of the full day. The above mentioned authors are men whose learning can not be questioned, whose piety is undoubted, and whose earnest devotion to the truth of God and the welfare of their fellowmen is known by their works.

others. But it is not the province of science to establish these propositions; it seeks to answer the questions, what is God? and what is the vegetable kingdom? And at no time yet could believers understand the subjects of theology fully. The understanding and comprehension of them are always only approximately and relatively correct and complete. The more nearly perfect the truth in any theory or doctrine is the longer will it be acceptable to the church. And yet some doctrines that are old are far from setting forth the truth correctly and fully. But what we wish to say in this connection is that what once is true is not necessarily always true. That is to say, the theological conceptions and theories of one age may be true for the people at the time. They are the highest and best they can reach in their day and for them they must be true. They have nothing else to guide and govern them. They make their formularies according to the knowledge they possess. But these then may no longer be true for a subsequent age that has acquired more light and knowledge on the subject. Truth is not something "bottled up in Leyden jars" to be passed from one generation to another. That is the position of the Roman church. What the church once has taught she must always teach. So Rome says. But she stultified herself by condemning Galileo who denied that the sun moved around the earth. And she has stultified herself in other ways, too. If that position were true then neither the Reformation of the sixteenth century, nor any other Reformation, could be justified at all. The old doctrines must be kept. Then the doctrines of purgatory, of the priesthood, of indulgences, and all the others, which the Reformers set aside and replaced with new doctrines, must be maintained. And then we must believe as the fathers did that mankind was in the hands of the devil and that Jesus by dying redeemed mankind by paying the ransom to the devil. And many other things we would be required to believe by that position, which, however, no one will believe. No, the principle of Protestantism opens the way for reformation, for revision, correction, and abandonment of doctrines and for the formation of new ones.



No protestant thinker, who is true to his fundamental principle, can hold that any age shall be authoritative for all other ages; or that the church at any period can set up a standard for all time to come. And yet there are those who are always ready to oppose all new conceptions and theories by quoting against them the confessions and teachings of former ages. But that is setting up a spurious Romanism that is worse than the genuine article. According to the Protestant principle there is only one thing that is authoritative for the theologian and that is truth; it he must seek; it must guide him; it he must obey. He may find it in an old doctrine or in a new one. But it is not the age of it that makes an old doctrine true. As has been the case in hundreds of instances, the old is often compelled to yield in the larger light and greater knowledge of later times, and give place to the new.

There is another adage that is sometimes flung with an air of triumph at those who are advocating a revision and modification of old doctrines, "What is new is not true, and what is true is not new." So it is said. But when this machine is taken apart no explosive material is found in it! it is a very innocent affair, and need not frighten any one. It may create consternation among women and children, but will not affect men who have seen such things before. If what is new is not true because it is new, then nothing is true. For every doctrine in theology was once new. And if it was not true when first conceived and formulated, how did it become true? Does a doctrine change its character from false to true as it grows old? Or are true doctrines born old? A little examination into the matter at once reveals the absurdity of the saying as applied to theology. The reverse of this position is more likely to be correct. Conceptions of divine realities and theories of divine operations are usually more true at the beginning than later on. They are liable to wear out as they grow older and to lose their power of authenticating themselves to the minds and hearts of believers. As repeatedly said in this paper, objective facts remain the same and are always true, and to the extent that the



truth of the fact enters into the doctrine based on the fact will the doctrine always be true. But as that doctrine is revised in the recurring ages it will come to embody an increased measure of the truth. That Jesus Christ died for the salvation of sinners is a truth that runs through all the theories of the atonement from the first to the last. But this does not set aside the fact that theories on the subject have been changing, nor does it prove that the oldest theories are the true ones. The first theory was that Christ's death was a ransom paid to Satan for the redemption of humanity over which Satan had obtained a legal right through the fall; another theory was that the sin of mankind is a debt, that Christ by His death paid the debt; of this theory various modifications have been proposed; there has also been a governmental theory, and a moral influence theory. Neither of these theories as it was originally proposed, is now accepted by a large body of theologians in Germany, England or America. But if antiquity invests a doctrine with authority then the first theory of the atonement ought to be owned as the true one; and yet nobody believes it now, nor has believed it for many centuries past. The history of other doctrines on essentials of the faith goes to prove the same position.

From what we have written it must not be supposed that in our view the past is of no value and must be cast aside. Not that at all. The knowledge and wisdom of the past is of immense value. A knowledge of the past is absolutely essential to a knowledge of the present. No one will be able to formulate a doctrine in the present that will be at all adequate, unless he has first acquired a thorough understanding of the teaching on the same subject in former ages. But our contention is that no age can furnish a standard of theology for all subsequent ages, that antiquity does not invest any theory with authority to bind men's thinking on the subject for all time to come, and that because a doctrine is old it must necessarily be true. If the history of christian doctrines shows anything, it proves beyond all reasonable doubt that theology is a progressive sci-

ence, and that doctrines must needs be revised from time to time, and that new conceptions must be evolved and new theories wrought out in order that the christian faith may authenticate itself to the christian consciousness of the age. Neither has it been our purpose to defend any particular doctrine or doctrines of a late origin. Our sole aim is to defend the liberty of thought on religious subjects as guaranteed to us by the principle of protestantism, and to deny the right of past forms of faith and doctrine to exercise an absolute authority over the minds and hearts of believers in the present day; creeds and confessions and doctrines, whether of the sixteenth or earlier centuries, valuable, instructive, and inspiring though they be, dare not be set up as so many popes to say to us, thus far but no farther. The theology of the twentieth century will be different from that of the past; but it will not be final; there will be more to follow.

We wish to make an observation in this connection which we believe to be worthy of the serious consideration of all thoughtful persons. As far as our observation and information go those ministers of the gospel who believe in a progressive theology and whose theological conceptions and views may be regarded as new and liberal rather than old and conservative are among the most earnest, enthusiastic and optimistic workers in the vineyard of the Lord, laboring faithfully and hopefully for the conversion of sinners and for the amelioration of men and women in every relationship of life in this present evil world.

We will conclude the discussion of our subject by a quotation from *The Problem of Final Destiny*, by Dr. William B. Brown, which will show the line of thought a pious and faithful pastor pursued after he had passed the three score years and ten limit. He in the first place states that the early parts of the Old Testament were a revision of traditions and beliefs that had previously existed: that the later portions of the Old Testament were in part at least a revision of the earlier ones; and then he says: "The New Testament is, to a great extent,

a revisal and restatement of the Old; Jesus revised the Jewish conception of Himself and His Kingdom. He revised the ten commandments, taking them out of the negative and putting them in the positive form. He revised and modified the fourth commandment, retaining its spirit, but rejecting its letter. He enlarged the meaning of the fifth commandment, making murder to consist not alone in killing, but equally in hating one's brother. The seventh commandment was greatly expanded, so as to include thoughts equally with deeds. Christ revised the Jewish conception of God, making Him a Father and a God of love. \* \* \* He put a new estimate upon man no less than upon God; He brought life and immortality to light as the Old Testament did not; He made all men brethren and children of a common Father. \* \* \* Then, again, the apostolic age witnessed, to some extent, though perhaps unconsciously, a revisal and restatement of Gospel teaching. Christ laid down great principles; the apostles sought to reduce those principles to a system of doctrine; they did more; after the resurrection we hear almost nothing of the Kingdom of God, which was the great theme of the Lord's teaching. Now the Church, which Christ mentioned but twice, takes the place of the Kingdom which He spoke of about eighty times. No one can compare the Epistles of Paul with the Gospel, without seeing how great is the difference of expression between them." Then our author goes on to say that the fathers in the great councils revised the statements of the Apostles; that the Reformers of the sixteenth century revised the past; that other afterwards revised the Reformers; and thus revision and restatement have been the constant rule in the Church of God from its earliest dawn to the present day; and yet some timid souls always feel very much shocked when the revision of doctrines and confessions and beliefs is suggested.

Another word, nothing is ever gained to the cause of truth by calling opponents bad names. But we want to say that rationalism as known to history is an evil; and that superstition is just as great an evil. To deny the supernatural is

to take away the foundations of faith; but to base one's faith on a supernatural created by a blind imagination is the essence of superstition. It is also possible for the elements of heathenism to enter into our theological thinking. It is always well to guard against dangers from all sides.

## VII.

### EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

#### THE MESSAGE OF THE GOSPEL TO MEN WHO ARE GETTING RICH.

There has been a good deal said and written, of late years, concerning the message of the gospel to men of wealth. What does the gospel, or what does Christian ethics, require of men who are rich? Rich men have been getting a good deal of advice from preachers and social philosophers; and along with much that is good and worthy of consideration, they have doubtless also been getting much that is foolish and impracticable. To the question, what should rich men do with their wealth, various and conflicting answers have been given. One of these is that they should spend it in rich and sumptuous living, that would be befitting their fortune and their station in the world. This is the answer of the enthusiastic aesthete—the man who has seen, with rapturous emotions, the fine residences and the polite hospitality of the rich and cultured aristocrasies of the old world, who toil not neither do they spin, and yet are clothed in fine linen and fare sumptuously every day. That is a kind of life of which we have not yet had much in this country, and which appeals powerfully to the imagination even of some social philosophers and preachers who write books. For rich men—great plutocrats—millionaires, for these only are considered rich now—for such to live as ordinary men do, to clothe themselves and move about in the world as common mortals, it is thought, would be something mean and unworthy of their fortune. Let them live in million-dollar palaces, richly and splendidly furnished, well stored with the treasures of art and literature, and let them exercise the social functions with ease and grace. Let them live, not in vulgar luxury, but in elegant splendor; diffusing around themselves an air of high culture and refinement, such as shall affect and stimulate the sensibilities of their less fortunate neighbors. Such a life will be a pleasure to those who are rich; and it will be a benefit to those

who are not rich—the hod-carriers and clodhoppers who do the world's hard work, without getting much of its fruit. To these it will give an idea of a better life than that which they are themselves living, though not as something ever to be participated in by them. In fact, rich men can, in this way, diffuse around them an air of elegant ease and culture that may elevate the whole country. Even the very slaves will pick up something of the refinement of manners belonging to the rich classes, provided these will try to be something more than money bags. We have seen such views held up in all seriousness as the message of the gospel to men of wealth.

But a more common view, doubtless, is that at least a part of the accumulated wealth of the rich should be spent in public benefactions. The community which has made them rich, or which has afforded them the opportunity of acquiring wealth, should at least, when they have no more use for it, get back a part of their accumulated treasures for its own benefit, and for the trouble which it has had with them. This is by many supposed to be the message of the gospel to rich men. Let them, for instance, give parks, or public buildings, libraries, art galleries, gymnasiums, or similar gifts, to the towns or cities in which they live. Such establishments will be a great comfort, especially if they are elegantly equipped, to the weary toilers, who live in tenement houses, and enjoy none of the comforts or amenities of life. Or if the rich are not disposed, in this way, to rear monuments to their memory "more enduring than brass," then let them give charity in a more direct and literal way. Let them, for instance, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and take care of the sick who are not able to take care of themselves. Let the rich build hospitals, or asylums, for the sick, the poor, the blind, the helpless and suffering of all kinds and conditions. *These must be cared for by the community.* The hungry, the naked, the sick can not now, after nineteen centuries of Christianity, be left to starve, and freeze, and die on the streets of our great and rich cities. And should not the great and rich men of the cities use some of their ac-

cumulated thousands, or millions, in helping to bear these common burdens? Would that not be eminently worthy of the gospel? And would it not be all the more appropriate as, during their active business years, they concerned themselves with little else than making money, leaving such matters as charity and even *taxes* to rest entirely upon the shoulders of their brothers who were not getting rich? And, then, there are the churches, the schools, the missions, and other interests of religion to be supported. The establishment of colleges, seminaries, and universities is also one of the things in which the rich could spend to good purpose some of their superfluous wealth. The fact is that some of these interests can not much longer be supported, if the rich do not largely come to their help. The church especially looks to the rich, that is, those who have much goods laid up for a long time to come, to support her enterprises; for from present appearances it would seem as if the timewere not very far off when the poor, those who have no store laid up for the future, shall not be able to give her much support. Hitherto these have been her chief benefactors; but their struggle for existence is continually becoming harder, and it may not be long when they shall have nothing more to give.

Now, we do not say that in all this there are not suggestions worthy of consideration. There are circumstances in which accumulated wealth can be used piously and to good purpose, perhaps in all these ways. There are times and circumstances in which the best thing that a rich man can do is to found a college, or a university, or a hospital, or a church. After wealth has been accumulated, in whatever amount, something must be done with it; and to scatter it from one's front door steps for the poor to pick up, would be bad policy. Nor would it be good policy to hoard it for one's relations, and let them found on it a plutocratic-aristocratic "family." In such circumstances the best thing that can be done may be to found a university. We are not sure that it would not be a good plan to pay off a part of the national debt; especially when the hoarded millions have been gained to an extent by a sly dodging of the tax col-



lector.\* But after all, these suggestions do not go to the root of the matter; and we do not believe that they exhaust the message of the gospel to men in regard to the use of wealth. In fact, in most cases the message of the gospel comes too late when it comes to *men of wealth*. By the time men have gained wealth, they have usually formed habits, also, which make it difficult, if not impossible, to give any attention to the message of the gospel. In the getting of wealth there is generally a character formed that is not very susceptible to any suggestions or influences that may come from the spirit of Christianity. This is, doubtless, the reason of those severe warnings against the perils of wealth, which we meet with so often in the Sacred Scriptures. It may be said, indeed, that the peril lies not in the *possession* of wealth, but in the *love* of it. That may be true; but that love arises almost inevitably from the daily cult of money; just as a hard and loveless character is an inevitable result of the habit of regarding *men* merely as *instruments* for making money.

This peril of wealth is often illustrated in the Bible. In the Gospel there is a case, for instance, of a rich young man who came to Jesus and asked Him what he must do in order to obtain eternal life. Jesus answered him: "Go, and sell whatever thou hast, and give unto the poor; and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me." That was the message of the gospel to that particular young man. And he was not an especially bad young man. He was one who had kept the commandments. He was moral. He possessed so many

\* During the last year the mayor of McKeesport, Pa., stated publicly that in that town the property of the Iron and Steel Trust is assessed at four per cent. of its market value, while the houses and shops of the ordinary citizens are assessed at seventy-five per cent. See *Outlook*, for August 17, 1901. Mayor J. L. Johnson, of Cleveland, Ohio, and Professor Bemis are authority for the statement that in Ohio railroad property is assessed at 21.4 per cent. of its market value, while farm property pays tax on seventy-five per cent. of its value. See *North American*, September 6, 1901. Jay Gould's estate of \$75,000,000 used to be assessed at \$500,000! Who pays the taxes in this country? Who pays for the security of the rich man's millions?

fine qualities that Jesus loved him. But that message of the gospel was too much for his moral ability. His countenance fell, and he went away sorrowful; for he was one that had great possessions. Had his possessions not been so great, or had he been required to sacrifice only a small portion of them, he might have been able to accept the message; but in the circumstances he was not able to do so. In his case, as in innumerable other cases, the pursuit of Mammon has had a decidedly bad influence on the man's soul. His wealth has taken possession of him, and made him hard and cold. The only thing that could save him now would be to tear him violently away from his idol. But that he would not suffer. When the treasure for which he, and perhaps his ancestors before him, have struggled, is now safely in his hands, he *can not* let it go; he would rather go to perdition with it. To him, though apparently still young in years, the message of the gospel came too late. It is well known that this incident is often quoted by Roman Catholic writers in favor of the so-called doctrine of *evangelical counsels* and of *supermoral merit*. It is, however, not so presented in the Gospel. The young man is commanded to part with his goods, not in order that he may acquire supererogatory merit, but in order that he may himself be saved. His wealth had acquired such an influence over his soul that his own salvation was imperiled; and to rid himself of the influence, it was necessary to part with the wealth. And that is no doubt true in innumerable other cases. There is an insidious influence in the pursuit and in the possession of wealth which, if not constantly watched, will destroy the higher life and the better impulses of the soul. Wealth is only a means, not an end. It is a means to the happiness of self and of others. And when made an end in itself, or when selfishly used, it becomes a snare to the soul, which can not be trifled with, but must be utterly torn off and cast aside in order to safety. Jesus, therefore, knew what He was doing when He said: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God";

and preachers have no reason to apologize for preaching on this text before rich and worldly congregations, whose souls are in the same peril as was that of the rich young man.

But if the gospel is to save men from the perils to which riches expose them, its message ought to come to them, as a rule at least, not after they have gotten, but while they are getting rich. What, then, does the gospel require of men who are growing in wealth? First, it may be said, that they should watch lest, while they are getting wealth, the wealth should also be getting them, that is, lest the god whom they pursue should stealthily infuse his own qualities into their souls, which would be their perdition. A lump of gold has no feeling; nor has a heart inspired by the money king. But to be without human feeling is certainly to be without the Kingdom of God. But, secondly, and more particularly, it may be said that the gospel requires of men, if they are getting wealth, to get it in a manner consistent with the principles of humanity and with the law of Christian love. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is a command from which no Christian can absolve himself; and no one has a right to get wealth otherwise than in conformity with this command. But it is said sometimes that this is impossible—that the Mammon of unrighteousness is not to be gained in ways that are righteous. If a man would gain Mammon, he must serve Mammon, and must renounce all sentiments of love, all feelings of compassion and of human kindness. As the soldier who fights for victory must not be afraid to hurt his enemy, so the man who engages in the pursuit of the unrighteous Mammon must have no care or thought of the feelings of those whom he is trying to outwit or overthrow in the race. A man who is getting wealth can not have anything to do with any message of the gospel. He must fight, and do nothing but fight, until he has gained his end; and then, if he be so minded, he may sanctify his accumulated millions, by devoting some thousands as an offering of atonement for his soul. He can make his peace with the gospel after he has gotten his wealth; but he can not take the gospel as his guide

in the pursuit, for it would rather unnerve and weaken than strengthen him in the race. The gospel demands that if a man strive for earthly goods, he should strive lawfully, humanely, righteously, with due regard to the interests, rights, and feelings of his fellowmen. The ethics of the gospel enforces the law of love to one's neighbor as a law that is to be observed in finance, in industry, in merchandising, in all human activity. But this law is by many supposed to stand in the way of gaining wealth, and is therefore quietly set aside until the main purpose of life, which is money getting, has been accomplished. The maxim is: First gain the world by all means, and then settle it with God and your conscience afterwards.

Now, this plan might be reasonable enough, if the man who is gaining the world by all means, were meanwhile himself remaining unchanged. But this can not be the case. On the contrary, it is just his manner of appropriating and using the world that, more than any thing else, impresses upon his soul the stamp of *character*; and this is due to the fact that his appropriation of the world brings him into reciprocal relation to others of his kind. Hence some writers on ethics have gone so far as to suppose that the whole substantial content of the moral process consists of the volitional appropriation of the world by man. But in any case a man's character is profoundly affected by his manner of appropriating the world, or gaining wealth. If that manner is right, according to the correct ethical standard, then the resulting character will be right and good; and if that manner is not right, then the resulting character will be bad, and the end perdition of soul. But it were better a thousand times that a man should fail in the pursuit of wealth, than that he should succeed at such a price. For "what would it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what should he give in exchange for his soul?" Surely the man who has lost his soul in the pursuit of wealth, can not hope to buy it back by the expenditure of a small fraction of the wealth which he

has gained. In the Epistle of James there is a terrific picture, not often presented from modern pulpits, of the end of those who have gotten rich in disregard of the great law of justice and love: "Go to now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you. Your riches are corrupted and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and your silver are rusted; and their rust shall be for a testimony against you, and shall eat your flesh as fire. Ye have laid up your treasure in the last days. Behold the hire of the laborers who have mowed your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth out; and the cries of them that have reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth," James 5: 1-4. For *reapers* put workers in mines, mills shops, and factories, and we shall have a picture of scenes presented in our own day and country. But, surely, if such be the consequences of getting rich in defiance of the law of justice and love, it were better not to get rich.

Wealth is a social interest. It can be gotten only in mutual dependence upon and intercourse with one's fellows. The economic goods which constitute wealth can regularly be obtained by man only through exertion. They do not offer themselves spontaneously. But in order that such exertion may be thoroughly effective, there must always be a combination of the strength and skill of a number of individuals. Labor must be something social. One man by himself alone could not accomplish very much. He could at most only manage to obtain the barest necessities of life. Of comfort there could be no thought. Neither could there be any progress in economic life. Even in the most primitive times a number of savages combined could hunt the beasts of the forest to more advantage than if each one pursued them simply on his own account. And when it came to the rearing of the rudest huts a combination of the strength of several individuals was absolutely necessary. Such combination of labor is of immense advantage in all stages of human life. It makes possible an exercise of the abilities of different individuals for the common good of the

whole community. The man with large brawn and muscle, the man with deft and nimble fingers, and the man with keen perceptions and large skill may combine their different abilities, and so produce comforts for the use of the community, which no one individual could produce for himself alone. In a word, economic activity and economic progress depend upon a connection of men in society. No man can get wealth except by the help of his fellows; and the divinely intended order doubtless is that men should be mutually helpful to each other. One should give as much help to another as he receives from him.

But this combination of men in society, and this union of effort in the production of economic goods, makes it possible also for some individuals, of more ingenuity and daring than others, to avail themselves of the labor of their fellows for their own profit. It is in this way that the horse is used by man. We tame the horse and keep him for our use. To be sure we have got to feed him; but his service is of far more use to us than the feed he costs. The combination of men in society makes possible a similar result here. The more powerful and the more shrewd individuals may, either by violence or by cunning, appropriate the fruits of the labor of other individuals, as the owner appropriates the labor of the horse, and thus enjoy more than their own service has earned. If the fruits of industry were fairly divided in a community, all would have enough for their needs, and probably none would have great superfluity. But some, being more cunning than others, may employ their skill to prevent a fair division, and thus give rise to the establishment of great differences in the possession of goods. They may act with their fellowmen as we do with the horse, pay them a "living wage," that is, give them their feed, and take all the profits of their labor. It is thus that there arise great fortunes, on the one hand, and great poverty on the other. The accumulation of great wealth always implies the despoiling of many individuals of the fruit of their labor. "No man," says Ruskin, "can become largely rich by his personal toil. The work of his own hands wisely



directed will indeed always maintain himself and his family, and make fitting provision for his age. *But it is only by the discovery of some method of taxing the labor of others that he can become opulent.* Every increase of his capital enables him to extend this taxation more widely; that is to invest larger funds in the maintenance of laborers,—to direct, accordingly, vaster and yet vaster masses of labor, and to appropriate its profits," *Time and Tide*, p. 61. That is the way in which the fabulous fortunes of our rich men have generally been made. And a man is scarcely counted rich now unless he possesses a hundred or more millions. These millions represent the labor of many thousands of men who have been deprived of the just rewards of their toil. Their owners have not given any equivalent for them either by the work of their hands or their heads.

And what, now, has the gospel to say to all this? Does the gospel give its sanction to this inequality? Does it give its approval to the methods by which some men are now gaining the world; or, if not that, does it at least compound with them after they have gained it? We know of one man in the Gospel, who was a publican and had gained much wealth by extortion, or violence and fraud, and who, when the message of the Gospel was brought home to his heart, said: "The half of my goods I give unto the poor, and if I have defrauded any man, I restore it fourfold." But how many very rich men would act in such a way now, although it is what the very letter and spirit of the gospel require? The gospel insists on justice, and gives no promise that men can enjoy the gifts of the unrighteous Mammon and the blessings of the Kingdom of God at the same time. One or the other must be given up. But to give up the advantages of Mammon, as the publican did, is a most difficult and most rare thing to do, and there are few men who are equal to the task. And it is just for this reason that the message of the gospel to men who are getting rich should be emphasized, rather than its message to those who are rich. For the former there is hope; for the latter there is, to say the least, not much. To those who are getting rich by *exploiting* the



labor and toil of their fellowmen, the gospel says: *Do not get rich at all, if you must do it in that way.* Indeed, if you will observe the law of love and of brotherly kindness, doing unto your neighbor as you would have him do unto you, you will not be able to get very rich. You can get a competency doubtless for yourself and family; but you can probably not get very rich after the fashion of these times. This is possible only through the *exploitation* of your neighbor's life and labor, or through robbery of your neighbor in some other form; and that would be inhumanity which would in the end, when you shall come to stand before the judgment seat with nothing about you but your *character*, hurt you far more than your neighbor. You can not trample upon the rights of manhood, the rights of personality, in another, without hurting your own soul. Kant was perfectly right, and in harmony with the spirit of the gospel, when he said, "Always treat your fellowman as a *person*, never as a *thing*." And that is a very practical maxim for these times. It means: never reduce your fellowman, even in your own mind, to the condition of a mere instrument or machine, answering to a "number." That is worse than treating him as a slave. A slave still has a soul, and a personal name; but a mere machine or tool has none. And to treat a man as if he were a soulless tool, is bad both for the one who is so treated and for the one who so treats him. As for the latter, he does himself more injury than he does to the man whom he oppresses. His conduct reacts upon himself, and makes him hard, unfeeling, cruel, miserable; for, as Plato maintained, to do wrong is a greater evil than to suffer wrong. The merciless exploitation of one's fellowman can not be expiated by giving him alms when he is broken down and his labor is no longer profitable. To feed and clothe those whom one's own exploitation has made hungry and naked, is indeed something better than to let them starve and freeze; but it would have been better still if the hungry and naked had not been deprived of the power of feeding and clothing themselves. If the merciful Samaritan had himself been the man who had robbed and beaten the one whose

wounds he bound up, his kindness would hardly have been mentioned to his credit. That may, indeed, at time be a good way of using wealth; but it is not the best way of dealing with the mammon of unrighteousness.

The better way is to exercise one's activity and use one's power in such manner that the persons of those in fellowship with whom one is gaining wealth, may not be blighted and crushed, but developed and cherished, and encouraged and helped to provide for their own wants. That, we think, is the message which the gospel brings to men who are getting wealth. The getting of wealth imposes responsibility. Men who are getting rich by the labor of their fellowmen—and nobody ever gets rich in any other way—are their brothers' keepers, and are responsible for their safety, and for their physical and moral well-being. And this responsibility is in proportion to their power. Whether men make ten thousand or ten million dollars a year, whether they employ five hundred or five thousand persons, they are bound by the ethics of the gospel to treat those who labor for them, not as *under* them, but as *brothers*, not as *things*, but as *persons*, and help them to realize their rights as persons. Now the fundamental right of personality is the right of self-realization, of self-development, and of freedom. The right of personality, moreover, includes the right to the enjoyment of the fruit of one's labor, the right to the possession of property, the right to the exercise of religion and morality, and the right to happiness. To deny these rights to those who are engaged in one's service, is to depersonalize them, and make them feel as if they were beasts and not men, created only to swing hammers and carry burdens for the benefit of their superiors. And to rob men of their manhood in this way is to inflict upon them an incalculable wrong—a wrong that can not be made good by flinging to them some crusts of bread or worn-out clothes, when they are old and sick. The heathen even do as much as that. But it is not enough that those who are getting wealth do not injure the persons of those who help them to get it. The morality of the

gospel requires that one man, especially he who is strong, should help another, a weaker brother, to make of himself all that the idea of manhood implies.

It is well known that men differ in their power of self-assertion and self-realization. Indeed, it is this fact of difference among men that is usually appealed to in justification of the inhumanity and cruelty so often inflicted upon the less able and powerful. All men, it is said, are not made with equal capacities; some are stronger and more able than others; and in the struggle of life the weaker must naturally be defeated and driven to the wall. In the animal world that, certainly, is the case. The strongest animal in the herd gets the largest amount of food and grows the fattest. But is that designed to be the law also among men? We are sure that it is not the law of Christ. The law of Christ is, not that men should take advantage of the weaknesses of the weak, but that they should "bear one another's burdens," and that "the strong should bear the infirmities of the weak, and not please themselves." We know that there are inequalities among men; but does that mean that "they should get who have the power, and they should keep who can"? "Ye know," says Jesus, "that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be servant of all," Mark 10: 42-44. That is the law of the gospel. The strong are for the weak, and the weak for the strong; and all are for all. It is true that all are not by creation and nature equal. But what is the Creator's purpose in this inequality? Is it that the strong should crush and devour the weak? No, it is that they should protect and help them—help them to be themselves, help them to be *men*. That, we believe, is the message of the gospel to men who are strong and prospering, and growing in the possession of this world's goods.

Let him who has the power assist men to become strong, and especially to be able to support themselves and their families,

and to lay up something for the future. The best help one man can ever give another, is to enable him to help himself—to be independent. And that is, we think, what the law of the gospel requires of the strong in relation to the weak. That is what Christ did; and He is the Christian man's example. A strong man can use his strength for the salvation of his weaker brothers, as well as for their destruction. By his strength he can inspire strength in others. He can breathe into them lofty desires, aspirations, hopes. He can arouse in the weak the desire and the strength to get their own food, their own homes, their own clothes, medicines, books, and comforts of all kinds. But he can also crush out what little spirit there is in the weak, and cause them to be content to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water," or, if nobody will give them the opportunity of hewing wood and drawing water, then to become *tramps*. It is not wrong for strong and able men who possess skill in the management of business, to employ laborers and create industry on a large scale. On the contrary, this may be their duty. They may in consequence of their ability be called to this very thing. If they are humane and honest men, they can, in this way, help the weak to grow strong; and thus they can spread around them prosperity and happiness. "Men fit to lead," says Carlisle, "should guide men fit to be led, into a higher and better life." This is not contrary to the gospel; it is what Christ Himself did. But what is contrary to the ethics of the gospel is the *exploitation* of men, that is, the use of their life and labor mere for one's own profit. All *employment* of other men's labor is not *exploitation*; although it may be difficult at times to tell where the one ends and the other begins. But when the difference between the *entrepreneur* and the employee is so great that the one gets more for his services in a single day than the other could make in a millenium of years, it is not difficult to say that something is dreadfully wrong. And the man who is willing to be governed by the principles of the gospel will not be long in finding out and correcting the wrong. Such a man may not make a fabulous fortune; but he will

make *men*. And to make ten thousand good, strong, intelligent, manly men, is better than to make a hundred or a thousand million dollars. In order thus to make men, however, one must himself be a *man*, and not a mere lump of iron or gold. Here is the difficulty with those who imagine that the nature of common men is totally depraved, and that nothing can be done with them or for them, but that only rich men are good. They never display the best qualities of manhood themselves. If even they do possess them, they shut them up in impenetrable palaces, and mysterious railroad trains, where nobody ever sees them; and consequently, of course, they can never influence or affect men for good. Let rich men show themselves to be thoroughly good men, bent on following the mind and example of the Master, and then see whether the common mass of men are so totally corrupt that they are not capable of elevation. It is usually supposed that ministers of the gospel, and others, should live such Christ-like lives, in order to gain the world for Christ. But is it not reasonable to suppose that great and prosperous men of the world are under the like obligation? And who can tell what the effect would be upon mankind, if this obligation were generally fulfilled?

---

PROGRESS OF THE REVISION MOVEMENT IN THE PRES-  
BYTERIAN CHURCH.

It was reported through the secular papers, a few weeks ago, that the committee on revision of the standards of the Presbyterian Church had made such progress in its work, that the end of its appointment was well nigh assured, although the plan proposed by it would still have to pass three General Assemblies and be approved by two-thirds of the Presbyteries before it could be considered as having been finally adopted. That plan, it was reported, proposes simply a declaratory instead of an explanatory statement on the subjects of predestination and infant salvation. These are the two points in regard to which the Presbyterian Church has recently been most seriously agitated. There are, indeed,

other points in regard to which there exists difference of opinion, and in regard to which some authoritative statements will be presented. One of these relates to the value of good works performed by unregenerate men; which in the Confession are declared *sinful*, but of which it will now only be said that "they can not please God, nor make a man meet to receive the grace of God." Another point relates to the Pope of Rome, whom the Confession declares to be "anti-Christ, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself, in the church, against Christ and all that is called God." For this the simple declaration is to be substituted that "there is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ." This is, in fact, a recantation which we doubt whether the Presbyterian Church ought to make at the present time. It will not serve to bring Romanism and Presbyterianism any closer together; for the spirit of Rome never changes, and Presbyterians have no mind to go to Rome. And while the fathers of the Assembly were doubtless in error as to their Biblical exegesis on this subject, yet we believe that they were entirely right in regarding the papacy as an anti-Christian, undivine power in the church.

But the two points of the Confession in regard to which there has been most anxiety are the subjects of predestination and of infant salvation. On these subjects the teaching of the Westminster Confession is contained substantially in the following three articles: (1) "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained unto everlasting death." (2) "These angels and men, thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed (appointed); and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished." (3) "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where, and how He pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry



of the Word." These are the "hard doctrines" which in modern times have served to bring Calvinism into disrepute, and which in the temper of these times can no longer be preached to Christian congregations. The instinctive feeling of Christian men is that they are not Christian doctrines. Whatever disconnected passages of Scripture may be quoted in favor of these doctrines, they are not believed to be in accordance with the teaching of Christ or with the analogy of the faith. And hence the demand for revision.

Now in regard to the subject of predestination in general it is reported that the "declaratory statement" adopted by the committee "does not change the wording of the Confession, but merely defines its meaning. The predestination of man, it is set forth, does not interfere in any way with his individual liberty, and is wholly consistent with God's love of mankind. It leaves to man freedom of will and entire responsibility for his acts and gives no sanction whatever to fatalistic inferences." This report, which is contained in *The Philadelphia Times* for February 11, 1902, does not claim to give the precise language adopted by the committee. On the presumption, however, that it was published by the consent and authority of the committee, it may be supposed fairly to represent its meaning. And on that supposition we ask, now, will this satisfy the reason and conscience of the Presbyterian Church, and will it silence the voice of discontent? It seems to be nothing more than what this church has all along had in its Confession; for in the very first section of the chapter on *God's eternal decrees* it is said that "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." It is here affirmed that God has from all eternity unchangeably ordained all that comes to pass in time, and consequently sin, too, and its punishment. And yet, it



is claimed, this immutable foreordination of all that occurs in time does not take away the creature's liberty, but rather establish it. Surely, if affirmation and denial of the same thing in the same breath could ever satisfy a reasonable mind, then this language of the Confession should be entirely satisfactory, and nothing more should be desired. And what now does the committee propose to do about it? It simply proposes to reaffirm this old contradiction in language that is but slightly changed. Man's predestination is to be so conceived that neither is his liberty taken away, nor his responsibility, nor is the love of God abridged.

This we do not think solves any difficulties. It leaves the old questions to stand just as they stood before. One part of the proposition merely affirms what the other denies. What sort of liberty, it may be asked, is that which a creature possesses when all that comes to pass in its entire life and history, and when even its eternal destiny is eternally and unchangeably fore-ordained of God, and nothing could turn out otherwise than it does? Can this be called liberty in any true and intelligible sense? Let us try to realize what men using such language could mean. Manifestly, if they mean anything, it could only be that the creature acting in accordance with the necessity of its nature (psychological necessity), or in accordance with the necessity of its divinely appointed destiny (theological necessity), meets with no insuperable external opposition to the mode of its action; it has no sense of any constraint put upon its action from without, the manner of which is entirely determined, not by the creature itself according to any *idea*, but merely by the necessity of its nature and destiny. But so neither has the planet any sense of constraint in its necessary conformity to the laws of motion, or the animal in its necessary conformity to the laws of instinct; and yet surely no one would say that the planet and the animal are free. What they do possess is only natural spontaneity, not moral freedom. If this were all that man possesses, then man would be merely an animal—a natural thing

—a mere link in the chain of necessary physical causation; and morality would be merely a branch of physics. Sin in that case would after all be only an operation of nature, or of the first cause, and so also would be the punishment of sin. It might, then, be said, indeed, that if men are damned, it will not be because they are non-elect, but because they are sinners. But, then, their sins are the necessary consequence of their divine fore-ordination. They are fore-ordained to sin, and bound to sin because they are fore-ordained, and, then, they are damned because they sin; and this is a "glorious manifestation of God's justice"! If that were the case, then the fate of the non-elect man would be much like the fate of the wolf, whom men shoot, not because he is a wolf, but because he kills sheep, although his killing sheep is only the necessary consequence of his having the nature of a wolf. Is that the kind of logic that will satisfy the mind of the Presbyterian Church? Does it not look as if the doctors of this church were engaged in playing a game that must make them feel as the ancient soothsayers are said to have felt when they looked one another in the face?

Or by affirming the liberty and responsibility of the creature, does the committee intend to cancel the idea that predestination involves the immutable fore-ordination of all that comes to pass in time as well as the absolute predetermination of the eternal destiny of the creature? If so, then the conception of predestination is essentially changed, and with the new conception which thus results no fault could perhaps be found on Christian or philosophical grounds. But if this had been the intention of the committee, would it not have been better to have said so? The same question arises in regard to the committee's proposed declaration that "man's predestination is wholly consistent with God's love of mankind." But on the supposition that the old Westminster conception of predestination is to be allowed to stand, we ask, what sort of *love* would that be which eternally fore-ordains a large part of mankind to eternal death? What good would

such love do its objects? By love we usually understand a feeling of kindness and good will. Love worketh no ill to the object upon which it is set. In fact, love is the communication of one's self to another, and a participation in the lot of that other, in order to the enhancement of its well-being. How, then, would the fore-ordination of any creature to eternal death be consistent with the idea of love? In order to be thus consistent, predestination would have to be a very different thing from what it is declared to be in the Westminster Confession. If it were said, for instance, that predestination is the fore-ordination of souls to various forms and degrees of good, then we might be able to see how it could be reconciled with the idea of love. Then the election might be said to be an *election of grace*—the *Gnadenwahl* of German theologians. In all cases love would be the determining principle of the divine decree. *All* would be elect, or chosen, each for some particular place, and service, and blessedness, and glory in the organism of God's eternal kingdom. That would be a doctrine of predestination, such as was taught long ago by Schleiermacher, Ebrard and Lange, and we believe by the Bible, too; but it would not be the doctrine of the Westminster Confession. The latter teaches a twofold election, one of grace, or good will, the other of disfavor, or ill will. Certainly, eternal death is not a good but an evil; and the motive of fore-ordination of any one to this end could not be love in any intelligible sense. How this Presbyterian revision committee could, therefore, hope to convince any one that the Westminster doctrine of predestination is consistent with the idea of the divine love as universal good will towards mankind, is a question that passes our comprehension. Does the committee, perhaps, intend to recommend the Hopkinsian theory, that the highest good of *mankind* requires the eternal perdition of one-half of the individuals of the race, and that in this sense the reprobation of *some* is consistent with love to the *whole*? We do not think that that kind of teaching would now be widely accepted. But if the committee thinks that the Westminster

definition of predestination is not correct, that God's love towards men is really universal, and that what is said about fore-ordination to eternal death is not true, then it ought to say so, and advise a correction of the language of the Confession. To make assertions that simply confound language we do not think will tend to promote peace and harmony in the church. And we have no doubt that there are men on that committee who thoroughly appreciate this fact, and deplore the hard lot which seems to compel them, for the sake of a temporary expediency, to act contrary to their own better judgment.

But the committee is not any more happy in its treatment of the matter of infant salvation than it is in its treatment of the general subject of predestination. On this matter the committee proposes the following statement: "All infants, dying in infancy, being included in the election of grace, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, Who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth." Here a number of questions arise. First, what is the force of this participial clause, "being included in the election of grace"? Is the participle *attributive*, and does the clause mean *all dying infants, who are included in the election of grace, and none others*? In that case the phrase, "being included in the election of grace" is not equal in extent with the phrase, "all dying infants," and in fact implies that there are some dying infants who are not elect, and therefore not saved. But that is only the old doctrine over again, only more diplomatically and less plainly stated. Or is the participle to be taken *adverbially*, and does the clause mean, "*because, or inasmuch as* all infants dying in infancy are included in the election of grace"? The latter may be supposed to be the sense intended by the committee, although there is nothing in the language of the sentence that will prevent others—if there are still any who believe that there are infants in hell not a span long—from interpreting it in the former sense. But in case we adopt the latter sense as the one intended by the committee,

then the next question is, how does the committee know, or how does anybody know, that all infants who die in infancy are included in the election of grace? What special revelation have these Presbyterian theologians had on this subject? Is there anything in reason or Scripture that justifies such a conclusion? On what ethical principles could the idea be based that all dying infants are elect, while their parents, who have nurtured them, cared for them, and suffered for them, may be among the reprobates? Why does not God allow all to die in infancy? But if He did, what would become of the race? Why this fatal injustice in the divine providence? Could God not prevent it?

But we may be told that this is a matter not to be reasoned about. It must be decided by revelation. To the law and the testimony, then. To what Scripture will the advocates of this new doctrine appeal? We know that they sometimes refer to the declaration of Jesus, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of Heaven." But we submit that, if this passage proves anything, it proves too much for the purpose here in view. It speaks of *all* infants, not merely such as die in infancy. If it proves anything in regard to election, then it proves that all infants, without exception, are elect; or if any exception be admitted, it must refer to those who fail to come unto Jesus, or who are not brought unto Him, as in baptism, for instance; but it can have nothing to do with the question of living or dying in this world. We repeat, then, that if this, or any other like, passage proves anything as to election, it proves that *all infants* are elect. But as the election is based upon an eternal and unchangeable decree, those who do not die in infancy can not be supposed some time, when they have come to years of maturity, to cease to be elect. Once elect, always elect. And the necessary consequence of such a view will be universal salvation, either here or hereafter, as Schleiermacher teaches. We, for our part, should consider such a doctrine as Schleiermacher's infinitely preferable to that of the Westminster Con-

fession, or to that proposed by the committee on revision. It does at least not do violence to our Christian conception of God, or to our ethical view of His government of the world.

But there arises still another question in regard to this new doctrine of infant salvation, namely, what is meant by "regeneration and salvation through the Holy Spirit, Who worketh as He pleaseth, in the case of infants and other persons who are not capable of being reached through the ordinary ministry of the gospel"? Would not such an operation be merely a physical operation? The fact that its subject is the Holy Spirit does not of itself make it spiritual or moral. When in the process of creation the Spirit of God brooded over the unformed matter of the universe, imparting to it form and life, that was an operation by the Spirit, but it was not for that reason a spiritual operation. What makes a divine operation spiritual is its method and the manner in which it is responded to by its object. A spiritual operation is one that takes place in the spirit, or in the reason and will of its object, and looks to the production of *character*. If the Spirit by a mere physical operation can regenerate a soul, then regeneration is merely a physical process, and salvation is a physical gift. But if the salvation of infants is to be viewed in this light, there certainly is no longer any reason to object to the *opus operatum* doctrine of the Christian sacraments. In fact, we should be greatly surprised if most intelligent persons would not much prefer the Romish dogma of baptismal regeneration to this uncertain and precarious theory of a physical regeneration by the Holy Spirit. What is salvation? It is common now to regard it as consisting in *character*. Salvation does not consist merely in getting into heaven after death; nor does it consist in any physical change in the substance of the soul, but in a spiritual *wholeness* of the soul, or in personal character achieved by personal energy under the stimulating influence of the Spirit of Christ. If, however, salvation could be accomplished by a physical operation of the Holy Spirit, changing something in the substantial nature of the



soul, then the question would at once arise, why are not all men saved in the same easy way? Why only infants, or persons not capable of being reached by the ministry of the gospel, that is, *idiots*? If God could regenerate and save the soul of a dying child by a merely physical operation, why not also the soul of a dying man; and if one, then why not all? Shall we be told that the difference results merely from God's good pleasure, or from the determination of His sovereign will, which obeys no reason and gives no account of itself, then we answer that that conception of God is not the Christian, but the Mohammedan conception. According to the Christian conception God is rational, righteous, and holy love; and upon that rock the theology of "absolute sovereignty" must at last split; and the effort of saving it a little longer in the Presbyterian Church we regard as merely useless waste of labor. It is, in our opinion, a thing devoutly to be desired and prayed for that this great church should be done with this foolish thing, so that it might be able to enter upon a new career of usefulness in this modern world, such as it has not enjoyed for a long time past.

There is, however, one more point in this revision movement, which we desire to notice, and that is its bearing upon the theory of sacred scripture. Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, who is a member of the revision committee, is authority for the statement that the present movement has nothing to do with the Briggs controversy of several years ago, which turned upon the question of the composition, inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible. Dr. Johnson is reported to have said: "We do not say that errors that do not in any way affect faith or the standard of life may not exist in the scriptures. We know that they are there. \* \* \* We continue to assert the broad doctrine that the Scriptures are inspired by God, and in their bearing on the rule of faith and life are unerring." That is something very different from the notion of verbal inspiration and verbal infallibility; and we submit that, if that is the actual belief of the Presbyterian Church at the present time,



then that church ought now to apologize to Professor Briggs, pay the expenses of his trial, and humbly beg him to come back into its fold. For Dr. Briggs taught nothing more than what is here admitted to be the faith of the Presbyterian Church. He constantly affirmed that, while there are errors in the Bible, errors of science, of geography, of history, and so on, these are not supposed to affect any doctrine of faith or morals. The Bible *as a whole*, interpreted according to Christ, or according to the spirit and analogy of the faith, is an infallible standard of Christian faith and life, whatever may be thought of single passages and statements as disconnected from the organism of Scripture. The command, "thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," Ex. 22: 18, which implies that there *are* witches, and has been an occasion of untold misery in past ages, and the advice to prefer slavery to freedom, are not infallible divine propositions; but the moral teaching of the Bible as a whole must be regarded as absolutely true and divine. On that platform, we think, Professor Briggs would be perfectly willing to stand. On that platform we stand. We accept the Bible as a whole, interpreted according to Christ, as the infallible standard of faith and practice. That is Christological theology, as we understand it. And we should be glad to know that that is the attitude now also of the whole Presbyterian Church. We believe, however, that before this church shall have gotten through with its present difficulties, it will have to come to a more definite understanding as to the inspiration, nature, and purpose of Holy Scripture, than it now possesses.

## VIII.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

[Any books noticed in this REVIEW can be obtained, at the lowest prices, of the *Reformed Church Publication Board*, 1306 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.]

**THE RATIONAL BASIS OF ORTHODOXY.** By Albert Weston Moore, D.D. Pages 378. Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Boston and New York, 1901. Price \$1.75, net.

This book is dedicated "to students in colleges and other educational institutions, and to all thoughtful persons in the pulpit and the pews who are in sympathy with the obvious teachings of the New Testament, but have been misled by the one-sided trend of contemporary thought into suspecting that their religious hopes can not claim a rational sanction of as high a kind as attaches to secular beliefs." This dedication expresses in general the aim and scope of the book; and the latter determines its content and method. It is not the author's purpose to furnish "an exhaustive treatment of the subjects to which the various chapters are devoted," but "simply to trace in outline the course of reasoning by which what is commonly known as evangelical Christianity may be coördinated with other beliefs, scientific or philosophical, which men of education deem themselves justified in confidently adopting." The book is divided into thirteen chapters with the following headings, respectively: *The Rationality of Faith; Evolution of Theism; The Ethical Background of Nature; Inductive Theism; Christian Supernaturalism; A Study of Human Testimony; Inspiration; Dogmatic Christianity; The Incarnation; The Atonement; Justification by Faith (Psychological); Justification by Faith (Practical); Love and Service.*

On the subject of the rationality of faith the author criticises the position of Descartes and Huxley to the effect that in religion, as well as in science, nothing should be believed except on proof so convincing that doubt would be impossible. "Give unqualified assent to no propositions," says Descartes, "but those the truth of which is so clear and distinct that they can not be doubted." Our author contends, on the contrary, that in religion such proof can not reasonably be demanded; but that here men should be satisfied with *probability* instead of absolute certainty. The latter is unattainable in regard to a number of ideas, such as the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the reality of miracles. In regard to these and other ideas we can have no scientific demonstration; but reasonable men should be content with probability; which, indeed, is so strong that faith is perfectly rational. This, it will be perceived, is Bishop But-

ler's view, and is doubtless correct on the supposition that religion is only a natural phenomenon in the constitution and life of humanity. And this is perhaps the only argument available in the case of persons who are not yet believers in Christianity. But this after all leaves Christianity in a certain measure of doubt, which, according to our author, is bridged by the exercise of *volition*. We believe because we will to believe. But is this quite satisfactory? Will not every Christian believer say that he is entirely *certain* of his faith? What, then, is the ground of this certitude? Not sense-perception, or reasoning based upon sense-perception, but a direct intuition of supernatural truth. This truth is something that can not be approached by those faculties of the soul by which we approach the natural world; just as the phenomena of *light* can not be apprehended by the sense of *hearing*. But, as we are altogether certain of the existence of light though we can not hear it, so we are altogether certain of the truth of Christianity though we can not establish it by a process of natural ratiocination. We believe that the author's view of this subject would have been strengthened by the adoption and elaboration of this principle.

On the doctrine of evolution, which has been an object of so much dread to many theologians, Dr. Moore maintains that it is not in conflict with Christianity, or with the teaching of the Christian scriptures, at all. While he acknowledges that it has sometimes been held in an atheistic sense, yet he believes that the theory is to be reckoned among the permanent acquisitions of human thought, and that the "Book of Genesis ought long ago to have suggested some of the principles upon which Darwin laid stress." What will the theologians say when they are told here (p. 36) that "it is quite obvious that the primitive man whom Genesis describes belongs to a very low order of being"? Dr. Moore accepts the evolutionary view that the ontogenetic development is a recapitulation of its philogenetic development, and claims that the evolutionist is bound "to concede that the material side of embryonic development has its counterpart also in the evolutionary process, and that there is a being, higher than man, through whose influence the crowning type of terrestrial life is being elevated into an ever-increasing resemblance to a rational and moral archetype," p. 50. The presence of an ethical nature in the highest product of evolution, therefore, points to an ethical back-ground in universal nature. "We are driven, therefore, to the conclusion," our author says, "that there is an invisible being whom the race is coming more and more to resemble, that at the source of the evolutionary forces there is something which we may call a parent type, which, like the undiscoverable model in the embryo, is fashioning a likeness to itself out of ever-changing unlikenesses." The existence of moral evil

in the world finds its only explanation in the fact of evolution. From the evolutionary point of view, "evil did not come into the world as evil. It was originally even good, in the sense that it was necessary for the preservation of animal life. It was action devoid of immoral quality, because suited to the nature of lower organic types. It became evil in man only because he could conceive a higher standard of conduct. Moral evil began as the result of a battle between confirmed non-moral habits and a rudimentary conscience, in which the latter sustained a defeat. It originated in the perception of a higher moral ideal than man had hitherto known or was as yet willing to emulate. \* \* \* A man is wicked primarily because he continues to act as an animal after he has reached a stage of moral illumination which enables him to appreciate, to some extent, the relative lowness of animal conduct," p. 66. We have given these quotations because it has usually been supposed that the theory of evolution must necessarily be contradictory of the doctrine of the "fall." And some doctrines of the fall it doubtless does contradict. But are these doctrines necessary to orthodox Christianity? Our author thinks they are not. There is only one question in relation to this subject which the evolution theory does not answer, namely, why does the rudimentary conscience sustain a defeat? To that question there is no answer in the evolution theory, nor in any other theory.

What is said in the chapter on inductive theism is interesting, but we have no room to dwell on it. In the chapter on Christian supernaturalism we have a discussion of the question of miracles. "A miracle may be broadly defined," it is said, "as an event conforming to general laws which operate almost exclusively outside the field of one's normal experience." Miracles are not violations of the laws of nature. "The supernatural is only that which is above nature as we understand it, and a miracle in the common acceptation of the term is that which is above nature as any mortal being yet understands it," p. 110. The resurrection of Christ is the fundamental miracle of Christianity. The discussion of this subject is interesting, but may not be convincing to all minds. In the way of criticism we would only remark that, in our opinion, it is not correct to identify the idea of the *supernatural* with that of the *miraculous*, and that the miracle is something that belongs essentially to the religious and spiritual realm, not to the world of elementary nature, and that it can, therefore, never be an object of scientific explanation. The study of human testimony, in the sixth chapter, bears especially upon the history of our Lord's resurrection as contained in the Gospel narratives, and shows that the apparent discrepancies are no greater than such as are contained in accounts by different persons of the most familiar events in modern history.

The chapter on *inspiration* is one of the most valuable in this volume. Inspiration as a theological term is defined "as human genius applied with exceptional success to religious discovery and instruction, the profoundest entrance of human faculties into the realm of spiritual truth. The same mental elevation which has given the world many of its best ideas and facts in various departments of human research is called inspiration, in the religious sense of the word, when it has penetrated the unseen world and solved, to any important extent, the problems relating to it," p. 184. Inspiration, then, is not an extra-psychological infusion of knowledge into the human mind. On the contrary, it is productive thinking of unusual energy concerning God and divine things, which was the peculiar gift of the Hebrew race, and which is preserved in the Old and New Testaments. From the subject of inspiration the author passes to a discussion of the subject of *dogmatic Christianity*. He accepts what he calls "dogmatic Christianity," and regrets the present low esteem in which the doctrines of Christianity are held in contrast with its ethics. He believes, rightly we think, that the doctrines of faith are necessary as a basis for the Christian principles of morality. He does, however, not define precisely what he means by "dogmatic Christianity." He uses the term *dogma* sometimes as identical with objective truth, or reality, sometimes as identical with truths of faith, but mostly as signifying doctrines concerning revealed facts in contrast with ethical teaching. This is, however, not the sense in which they take the term who insist most strongly on the necessity of "dogmatic Christianity." By *dogma* they mean a formally revealed doctrine accepted and sanctioned by the authority of the church and, therefore, unchangeable and unimprovable. The notion of dogmatic Christianity, consequently, is inseparable from the notion of an infallible church. But that this is not the sense of Dr. Moore is evident from the fact that he speaks of the "wornout creeds of the past," to which will be added others that are not yet worn out, p. 211. The fact is that Dr. Moore himself takes considerable liberties with the old dogmas; as, for instance, when he intimates that the *divinity* of Christ rests rather upon His manifested attributes than upon a metaphysical sameness of essence with God, and that orthodoxy has gone too far "when it has affirmed that the Godhead comprises three persons who are yet not persons in any intelligible sense," p. 259. On the subject of the atonement he sets aside all the old theories as insufficient, though they may each contain some elements of truth. If any theory is possible on this matter, then the author thinks it must be a *subjective* one, to the effect that the atoning sacrifice serves to remove the barriers to reconciliation with God from the mind of the sinner rather than from the mind of God. On justification our author holds that it consists,

not in the imputation of another's righteousness, but in the realization of the divine pardon through faith on the part of the sinner, and in his growing conformity to the character of Christ through strength derived from the sense of forgiveness.

We have room only for a few words in conclusion of this review. And in the first place we express the apprehension that this book will satisfy neither the extreme conservative, nor the extreme liberal theologians. For the conservatives, who have learned nothing in half a century, it goes much too far, and for the extreme liberals it does not go far enough. It was, however, not written for either of these classes. It was written for the benefit of persons who sympathize with orthodox Christianity, but whose mind has been disturbed by the critical and scientific influence of the day. Now the conservatives are not disturbed at all, for they, as a rule, do not know enough of the critical and scientific movements of the time to feel their influence, and the extreme liberals have no sympathy with orthodox Christianity. But, in the second place, we express our conviction that for those for whom the book has been written it will have much value. It will serve as a helpful guide to conduct them from the old orthodoxy of the past, which is dead, to the new orthodoxy, which has come to take the place of the old. Christianity is ever essentially the same, but the form of apprehension is forever changing; and we are living in an age now when such change has become an imperative necessity, if the interests of Christianity are not to be greatly damaged. To all who feel this truth, and to all who *ought* to feel it, if they do not, we cordially commend this book. It will free them of their fear that the dissolution of the old dogmas will be the overthrow of Christianity, and will make them freer, happier, and more confident Christians.

**RECONSTRUCTION IN THEOLOGY.** By Henry Churchill King, D.D., Professor of Theology in Oberlin Theological Seminary. Second Edition. Pages, 357. The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Avenue, New York. 1901. Price, \$1.75.

This work is not a reconstructed system of theology, but rather a demonstration of the necessity of reconstruction, and a discussion of the principles on which it should take place. The author himself states his purpose by saying: "The book aims first, to show that such a reconstruction is needed and demanded, because of the changed intellectual, moral, and spiritual world in which we live; and then, to characterize briefly, but sufficiently, this new world of our day; and finally, to indicate the influence which these convictions of our time ought to have upon theological conception and statement, especially in bringing us to a restatement of theology in terms of personal relation." Theology, the science of religion, the author regards as *progressive*. It must grow as



science grows. Its task is endless. Each age must be its own interpreter in spiritual things. It is only in this way that religious truth can be kept fresh and vital. "That a generation should be content," says the author of this volume, "to say over again precisely as its predecessor did any form of truth, would mean that that truth was not a living one for them; that they did not care to translate it into living thought and language," p. 3.

Professor King does not join in the complaint that the present age is an irreligious age. He holds, however, that it is an age of dissatisfaction with the current expression of the meaning of religion, and that it needs a new statement of religion or Christian doctrine. The old systems of theology are no longer *vital* systems, and do no longer promote the understanding and the vigorous exercises of the Christian religion. In the language of Herrmann of Berlin, which Professor King quotes, "The old systems are not simply going; they have gone." There was much in the old systems of theology that was not Protestant. Again Professor King quotes Herrmann's saying that "we preserve what is in reality Roman Catholic dogma in a somewhat modified form." But of this the age is becoming more and more impatient. The age wants reality and freedom, and can no longer be satisfied with mere *forms* and *shams*. The modern mind can no longer be satisfied, in the sphere of religious and theological thought, with appeals to the authority of councils and ecclesiastical tradition, but on the contrary demands entire *freedom of conscience* and *freedom of investigation*. This, however, does not signify that the mind of the age is unchristian or unbiblical. Though the inspiration and character of the Bible are not apprehended now in the way in which they were once apprehended, yet the Bible is really more highly appreciated by the modern theologian than it was by the older dogmatician, who regarded it as a treasury of infallible proof-texts with which to bolster up his "system." This is apparent from the fact that so much stress is now laid upon *Biblical Theology* in distinction from what has heretofore been known as *Systematic Theology*. Nor is the mind of this age averse to Christ. Though it may no longer be able to repeat the old forms of doctrine concerning the constitution of Christ's person yet it is far more impressed with the fact of the *practical Lordship of Christ* and more influenced by His teachings than was the mind of any previous age. Professor King sums up the fundamental moral and spiritual convictions of our time in the following terms: "Reverence for personality, freedom of conscience, and freedom of investigation; law in the spiritual world, yet the subordination of the mechanical, and the unity of the ethical life in love; no separation of the sacred and secular; the social conscience, the central importance of action, the recognition of Christ as the supreme person," p. 45.



The influences from which have proceeded the new tendencies in theological thought have been mainly two, namely, *scientific*, and *moral and spiritual*. On the scientific side we have, first, the influence of natural science, and, secondly, the influence of the higher criticism of the Bible. These the author of this volume discusses at length. We have not room, of course, to follow this discussion in detail, but can only call attention to a few leading points. In science the author notices the principle of freedom of investigation. Modern science does not allow itself to be controlled by any theological determinations or positions; and this independence has come to be felt in theology, too. "Theology refuses to settle *à priori* how God *must* have acted in any case in nature or in revelation, but turns over to humble, patient, scientific inquiry to determine how He *did* and *does* act," p. 49. Chapter VI., in the volume before us, is devoted to the consideration of *miracles in the light of modern science*. The discussion of this difficult subject is interesting, but, in the opinion of many at least, it will hardly be considered conclusive and final. There are some points, however, that may be considered as settled. One of these is that God stands in direct relation to man and nature, and that the order of the universe is one and has a spiritual end. The laws of nature have not their end in themselves, but are subordinate to the spiritual ideal to be realized in creation. Hence the possibility of miracles must be conceded; but as events in the outer sensuous world they will always encounter the difficulty of the fact that they have no experience in their favor. The discussion of evolution, in Chapter VII., is very able and suggestive. Of course the author accepts the theory of evolution as the true theory of the origin of the universe. But "evolution is a succession of stages with new phenomena and new laws—not uniformity or identity of laws"; and it "does not stop with the animal series, but includes the human stage." With the progress of evolution new and higher stages of existence will appear, and with them new and higher laws. "We are not to make the great but common mistake," says Professor King, "of supposing that the evolving organism contains in itself the source of all that follows." This is Drummond's mistake. "Evolution is not only to unfold from within; it is to infold from without," p. 83. "Something really new, then, appears in the course of evolution." God Himself is in the whole process, and comes to ever clearer manifestation therein; in consequence of which theology is now "quite unwilling to say that God is only where we can not understand Him"; and we would add that God is better revealed in the permanent order of the universe, than He could be in any apparent departures from that order.

The subject of Chapter VIII. is *the influence of the historical and literary criticism of the Bible*, or what is commonly called

*the higher criticism.* On this subject the author adopts what Canon Driver calls "the generally accepted conclusions of the critics." And he expects no great reaction against these conclusions to occur in the future. And "these conclusions taken together give a different conception than that held by the traditional view, of the dates, authors, and mode of composition of the books of the Old Testament," p. 124. But the same is true also of those of the New Testament." It would not be true at all to say that traditional views concerning the New Testament have not changed during this period (within the last sixty-five years); they have changed,—greatly and on many points." With the questions of the higher criticism in general, and with the changed views of the origin and nature of the Biblical books the readers of the REVIEW may be supposed to be familiar. But this change of views must exercise its influence at many points in theology; and this influence, according to Professor King, can not be otherwise than beneficial. It makes possible a more real historical interpretation of the Scriptures. "We can know more certainly just what the revelation meant to those to whom it first came." The critical study of the Bible has brought into prominence the great *purpose* of the Bible, to serve simply as a record of the historical self-revelation of God; it has shown that revelation is *progressive*, culminating in Christ, and that Christ alone is our ultimate standard, by which all that precedes must be tested; it has made clear that there is variety in Biblical teaching, and that each writer reflects an *individual* phase of doctrine; it has shown that the Bible must be used organically, not mechanically as it was used by the old writers of creeds and dogmatics; and finally it has produced a new doctrine of *inspiration*. It is now perceived that in order to the right understanding of the Bible its readers must be inspired as well as its writers. For the elucidation of these points we must refer the reader to the book itself.

Among the moral and spiritual influences in modern theological thought, Professor King lays stress especially upon two, namely, first, *the deepening sense of the value and sacredness of the person*, and secondly, *the growing recognition of Christ as the supreme person in history*. Under the first of these heads we have room only to refer to the author's inference in regard to sacramentalism. "If one chooses to say so this is to make all things sacramental; but it is the death of the older sacramentalism which lives on the assertion of the sole virtue of certain things. The older sacramentalism is sometimes simple superstition; and sometimes it owes its existence to the seeking of the relief found in it as a form of absolute abandonment of self—including reason—a strong instinct in those inclined toward an authoritative catholicism," p. 176. This emphasis upon personality results also in increasing emphasis upon the ethical and prac-

tical tests of doctrine. On the emphasis upon Christ as the supreme person in history and the supreme revelation of God, it is not necessary that we should dwell in particular, as the readers of this REVIEW have long been familiar with the *Christological idea* in theology. It may be well to say, however, that Professor King does not apprehend this idea in the sense in which it has been apprehended, for instance, by the mediational theologians, in the past, namely, in the sense of spinning a system of theology out of the abstract idea of Christ, as the God-man, by mere logical dialectics. It is rather the Biblical view of Christ and His consciousness and teaching that is here made the principle and test of theology. "We find in Christ," says Professor King, "not God and man, but God revealed because true man." On the doctrine of the immanent social trinity, as held by Martensen, for instance, Professor King says: "It can be no service to the church, it would seem, under this fresh and independent conviction to react toward a really metaphysical tritheism, affirming social relations and love within the Godhead," p. 191. The Unitarian movement, accordingly, had its justification in history, but did not solve the problem with which it was concerned. "There was needed a protest against tritheism; but Unitarianism took the wrong road to a true goal." We would add, however, that Sabellianism and Patripassianism are also roads to be avoided by the modern theologian.

The *reconstruction in theology* resulting from the foregoing conditions are treated in the last two chapters of the volume under review. The respective headings of these chapters are: *Religion as a Personal Relation*; and *Theology in Terms of Personal Relation*. The Christian religion is a personal filial relation to God in Christ. This conception is fundamental now in the study of Christianity. But if religion be a personal relation to God, why then does this relation not impress itself more strongly at all times upon our consciousness? This question Professor King answers at length, showing that the fact is in accordance with the moral life of man universally. There must be a certain obscurity in the apprehension of spiritual truth in order to guard the proper autonomy of the human mind. The laws of the Christian life are essentially analogous to the laws of a growing friendship. According to this conception of religion, now, theology must be stated in personal terms. Theology, in fact, must be *persono-centric*; which, of course, means that it must be *Christo-centric*, for Christ is the supreme person in history. Why theology must be stated in personal terms the author explains in the following propositions: "because of the growing recognition among theologians of this point of view; because religion is itself personal relation to God; because the philosophic trend is distinctly personal; because the moral and spiritual char-

acteristics of our time show that the personal has a new clearness for us and for greater recognition; because of the psychological emphasis on the entire man; because the whole problem of life is ultimately the problem of the fulfillment of personal relations; and because this personal conception lies closest to Christ's own thought and to the directest reflections of it in the New Testament," pp. 240-241. It will be seen from what has gone before that this work is rather a preparation for a reconstructed theology than such a theology itself. Though in many cases we can see how the author would reconstruct particular doctrines, yet the actual work of reconstruction remains still to be done. Professor King has pointed out the need for such a work, and inspired the desire and hope that it may be done speedily. Meanwhile we cordially commend this work of his to our readers who, we are sure, will find it a work profitable for study and for correction in theology.

**RULING IDEAS OF OUR LORD.** By Charles F. D'Arcy, D.D., Dean of Belfast, Author of *Idealism and Theology*. Pages 139. A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1901. Price 60 cents.

**THE EARLY CHURCH, Its History and Literature.** By James Orr, D.D. Pages 146. A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1901. Price 60 cents.

**PROTESTANT PRINCIPLES.** By the Rev. J. Monro Gibson, D.D. Pages 171. A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1901. Price 60 cents.

These three volumes belong to the series of *Christian Study Manuals*, in course of publication by the Armstrongs, of New York, and Hodder and Stoughton, of London, under the general editorship of the Rev. R. E. Welsh, M.A. The authors are English scholars of orthodox tendencies and acknowledged reputation. These *Study Manuals* are intended not so much for the professional theologian, as for intelligent Christians of all classes. But they are intended for study rather than for cursory reading, and their style and contents fit them especially for that purpose. There is in them no display of the apparatus of critical scholarship—no footnotes, for instance, or references to authorities. Every chapter, however, ends with suggestions for further study, and points to the available literature. This is an especially valuable feature for theological students, for the more advanced pupils in Bible classes, and for inquiring readers of all classes. The volumes of this series, so far as they have as yet appeared, are strictly orthodox after the accepted Protestant type. They have, however, not escaped the influence of modern theological learning; and in the treatment of every subject the experienced reader will find evidence of the new thought and spirit which came to prevail in the closing decades of the nineteenth century. The volumes display no negative criticism at all; they are, with one ex-

ception, throughout positive and constructive; but the authors are not ignorant of the methods and results of modern critical and ethical thought, as is plainly evident in all their pages; and this makes these books all the more valuable. The exception just referred to relates to the attitude of these volumes to *Romanism* and its kindred system *Anglo-Catholicism*. It is Protestant Christianity and Protestant theology for the defence and extension of which these volumes seem to have been written. They are not, however, even in this regard, offensively critical or controversial. Nor are they lacking in Christian charity and respect even for principles and dogmas for which it is not easy always for an earnest Protestant to have either respect or charity. Even while opposing what is believed to be Romish error the writers are entirely free from the spirit of *Romish* intolerance and harshness.

But as each of these volumes is complete in itself, it will be proper to give some consideration to each of them separately. The first volume, after a general introduction showing the different ways in which great men influence the world, and emphasizing the greatness of Jesus, discusses His ruling ideas in *two parts*, namely, *His Moral Ideas*, and *His Religious Ideas*. In the actual teaching of Jesus, indeed, morality and religion are never separated; but they may be distinguished and each treated by itself. According to Dr. D'Arcy the first and leading idea in the moral teaching of Jesus is the idea of the *Kingdom of God*. The origin of this idea is, with most modern theologians, traced to late Jewish literature, especially the Book of Daniel, from whence Jesus also derived the *title Son of Man*; and the difference between Jesus' conception of the Kingdom and the conception of His contemporaries is explained. "The Kingdom is the realm of love in which God is supreme. When, therefore, the Kingdom comes, it comes as a social blessing, and not as a blessing for each one in his isolation." This conception of the *social* character of the Kingdom of God as portrayed in the teaching of Jesus, is one of the conceptions in which the author shows the influence of modern thought. In the older theology the teaching of Jesus was regarded as being mainly concerned with the individual, and as looking especially to the salvation of the individual soul. But in more recent times it has been perceived that, as man is man only in society, his salvation can be accomplished only in society and in the amelioration of the social condition. Christianity, accordingly, has a social as well as a religious side. The morality of the gospel differs from other moral systems especially in respect of its *inwardness* and its *motive*. In the faith, hope, and love which constitutes its cardinal virtues, it possesses a new moral dynamic.

The second part of this volume is devoted to a discussion of the

ruling religious ideas of Jesus. The first of these is the idea of the fatherhood of God; an idea, which, as the author points out, is characteristic of the whole New Testament. There is a difference, however, in the idea of the divine fatherhood as it is related to the only begotten Son, and to man universally. Dr. D'Arcy insists upon "an intimate organic connection" between Jesus and God, the Father; he does not, however, assert an identity of substance. Still the teaching of Jesus is believed to be decidedly Trinitarian. This comes out especially in the teaching concerning the Paraclete and in the baptismal formula. In this teaching of Jesus, especially as given in the fourth Gospel, the life of every believer is made to depend upon the continual presence and activity of the Divine Spirit. In this connection we may quote Dr. D'Arcy's interpretation of "the water and the Spirit," in John 3: 5: "In the fourth and seventh chapters our Lord speaks of Himself as the source from which the Spirit flows to the soul of man. 'Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up unto eternal life.' And in the seventh chapter (verses 37-39), at the feast of Tabernacles, 'Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow streams of living water. But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believed on Him were to receive.' This latter passage is the best possible commentary upon the former." In this way, it will be observed, this famous passage concerning "the water and the Spirit" is shorn of its reference to Baptism. This will be to many an unwelcome conclusion. We believe, however, that either this conclusion must be accepted, or the composition of the fourth Gospel must be brought down to the middle of the second century.

Dr. Orr, the author of the volume on *The Early Church*, is well known to the American theological public as a voluminous writer on theological questions. He has distinguished himself especially by his opposition to the school of Ritschl. In the little volume before us, as well as in other productions of his pen, he shows, however, that he has himself learned something from this school, as he frequently refers to the writers belonging to it, especially Harnack. The time included in this volume embraces the first two and a quarter centuries of the existence of Christianity, or from the institution of the church to about A. D. 324. The volume is divided into ten chapters: the first giving an account of Jewish and Gentile Preparations for Christianity; the second, of the Apostolic age and later Jewish Christianity; the third, of Gentile Christianity—Nero to Domitian (A. D. 64-96); the fourth, of the age of the Apostolic fathers (A. D. 96-117); the fifth and sixth of the age of the Apologists (A. D. 117-180); the



seventh and eighth, of the Old Catholic Fathers (A. D. 180-250); the ninth and tenth, of the age of the great persecutions—victory of Christianity (A. D. 250-324). It will be observed, accordingly, that the entire time, from the Day of Pentecost to the year preceding the Council of Nice, is divided into six periods. Of these the *fifth* (A. D. 180-250) is called the age of the *Old Catholic Fathers*. It is the age of such writers as Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, Origin, etc. During this age, and under the influence of the most eminent scholars, and saints, and martyrs, the church gradually assumed that peculiar *Catholic* character which it continued to retain ever afterwards. And, indeed, considerable progress had been made towards this character even in the preceding age, namely, that of the *Apologists*; for during this age *Montanism* arose; and "Montanism," says Dr. Orr, "is best explained as a reaction against the growing rigidity of church forms, the increasing laxity in church morals and discipline, and the dying out of the spontaneous element in church life and worship." But the process which was begun in the age of the Apologists was concluded in that of the Old Catholic Fathers. It was this latter age that witnessed the development of the idea of *tradition*, of the *canon* of Scripture, of the episcopate, and of Apostolic succession, of sacramental grace, and of the rites and forms of worship which continued in use in the subsequent Catholic Church both east and west. All this is briefly but clearly brought out in this little volume of Professor Orr's. And we call special attention to this circumstance, as the fact that it can be done now without raising any suspicion or opposition indicates a radically different attitude of the theological mind from that which prevailed in former years. When Dr. J. W. Nevin published his famous articles, in this REVIEW, maintaining that Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian were not Christians after the modern Protestant, but after the Old Catholic type, a cry of indignation went up throughout the land, charging that the doctor himself was not a Protestant, but a Roman Catholic enemy in disguise. That was about the middle of the nineteenth century. Now in the beginning of the twentieth century Dr. Orr can affirm these same things in entire safety. No one will suspect him of being a Romanist or Jesuit in disguise for telling the truth of history. This indicates an advance in theological intelligence and tolerance during the last half century that should be thankfully appreciated by all lovers of truth. Of course, Dr. Orr, who is professor of apologetics and systematic theology in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, is as free from Romanism as any one can be, as is abundantly plain from this little volume on the history of the Early Church.

The last of the three volumes under notice, that by Dr. Gibson on *Protestant Principles*, is the most controversial in its tone. Of



course this is inevitable. No work on such a subject could be without polemic against opposing systems. Protestantism presupposes Romanism; and a defence of the former must in the nature of the case be an attack on the latter. It is, however, not only Romanism but everything that is like Romanism that the author of this volume does battle with. "Our controversy," he says, "is not with the Roman Church alone, but with all who hold the Sacredotal system, of whom the Anglo-Catholics are for us the most important."

After an introductory chapter, in which the author defines the points of agreement between Romanism and Protestantism, he proceeds to the discussion of Protestant principles, in three divisions, headed respectively, *the word of Christ*, *the work of Christ*, and *the church of Christ*. The central principle of Protestantism, according to Dr. Gibson, is *the all-sufficiency of Christ in religion*. "Our ultimate authority in religion is God in Christ speaking by His Spirit." But there are subordinate authorities, namely, first the *apostles*, and, second the *church*. The authority of the apostles is exercised through their *writings*. The church exercises authority in *administration* and *discipline*, but it has no commission "to pronounce authoritatively on the doctrines of salvation." This cuts up by the roots the whole idea of an infallible church; and the ultimate ground of certainty in religion can be nothing other than the testimony of the Spirit in the heart of the believer. The *right of private judgment* which Protestantism claims, is in the last resort nothing else than "the right to come into personal contact with the truth of God," and that truth in its substantial revelation is the Lord Jesus Christ. The *second division* of this book treats of the work of Christ *for us* and *in us*; and the author explains that the main difference between Protestantism and Romanism on this point consists in this that according to the former the work of Christ is entirely sufficient for our salvation, while according to the latter it needs to be supplemented by the work of other mediators, like the saints and angels. This is doubtless a correct statement from the standpoint of early Protestantism; but from the point of view of modern theology it may perhaps not be regarded as quite adequate. Does not early Protestantism proceed too much on the supposition that as to the ground and nature of salvation its Catholic opponents are essentially right, and that the controversy relates only to the conditions of its attainment? In our opinion both Protestants and Catholics labored too much under the mistaken idea that salvation, or justification, which they regarded as the same thing, rests mainly upon the *legal ground of merit*, and not upon the personal ground of character. The merits of Christ are sufficient for the complete salvation of all men, said the Protestant; while the Catholic claimed that they need to be supplemented by the merits of the

saints, etc. There is the *legal* principles in both views. The modern ethical view holds that salvation is in *character*, and that Christ is the author and source of that spiritual life in the believer, whose end is the development of a God-like character or quality in the soul. Dr. Gibson, it seems to us, here occupies too much the standpoint of the *old* Protestantism, rather than the *new*.

In the last division of the book before us we have the application of the principle of the sufficiency of Christ to the doctrine of the church and the ministry. The several subjects here discussed are the *nature* and *marks* of the church, the sole headship of Christ, the nature of the ministry, Christian worship, and the sacraments. In this discussion we meet with an earnest and intense opposition to *ritualism* as it is practiced by the Anglo-Catholics in the English Church. With the spirit and purpose of this discussion no sincere Protestant will have reason to be dissatisfied. We notice one point, however, in regard to which we can not quite agree with our author. In explaining the *opus operatum* doctrine of the sacraments he seems to make it mean that the sacraments are effective apart from the agency of Christ and His Spirit, in consequence merely of the prerogative of the celebrant. This we do not believe to be quite just to the Catholics. We believe that their idea is rather that the agency of Christ and the spirit is so tied to the outward performance that where the latter takes place, the former is bound to take place likewise, without regard to the faith or disposition of the recipient. But this does not make the doctrine any the less false or repulsive. In conclusion we earnestly recommend these volumes to the theological students, teachers of Bible classes, Sunday-school superintendents, and all intelligent Christians.

**THE APOSTLES CREED, Its Origin, Its Purpose, and Its Historical Interpretation.** A Lecture, with Critical Notes. By Arthur Cushman McGiffert, D.D., Washburn Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Pages 206. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1902. Price \$1.25, net.

The work here before us is one of more than ordinary interest to the student of theology. This interest is derived partly from the nature of its subject, and partly from the method pursued in the treatment of that subject. The Apostles' Creed must always be an interesting subject of inquiry, because of the place which it has held for many ages in the faith and worship of the church, and because of the very divergent views which have been entertained in recent times in regard to its origin and nature. The theological student well remembers what legends and fables have been related in regard to the manner of its composition and of its promulgation throughout the church. The story of its joint origin by the apostles, each contributing one of the twelve articles into which its contents may be divided, was believed for ages. That story,

indeed, has long been abandoned; but even in recent times some have entertained very exaggerated notions of its "wonderful structure" and its "inner logic," investing it with all the reverence that would be due to a perfect rule of faith miraculously communicated from heaven; while others have regarded it as a mere relic of popish superstition, which does not deserve a very high degree of respect from good Protestants. Both of these views are doubtless exaggerated, and therefore no longer tenable. And this circumstance must make the theological student all the more anxious for an unprejudiced and reliable account of this ancient symbol of Christian faith, which still holds its place in the churches. Such an one will, accordingly, welcome this able and scholarly work of Professor McGiffert with much interest, and study it with great attention.

The interest and value of this work are much enhanced by its *method*. It is not the old *deductive* method which began the investigation of a subject by the assumption of some *à priori* ideas, and from these ideas deduced the results which they logically involved. This method is now felt to be mischievous in all departments of thought, and in none more so than in the department of history. Dr. McGiffert's method is thoroughly *inductive* and *historical*. He does not approach a subject with a preconceived idea of what it *ought* to be, or *must* be, and then close his eyes to the facts connected with it; but on the contrary he studies the facts with open mind, and then draws his conclusions from them. This method is noticeable in his work on *The Apostolic Age*, which attracted so much attention several years ago; and it is now strikingly noticeable also in this work on *The Apostles' Creed*. From this peculiarity it happens that Dr. McGiffert's work can not be successfully opposed by mere contradiction or pointing of consequences. Whoever refuses to accept his results must not shun the labor of studying his facts with as much patience as he has shown himself. Dr. McGiffert may sometimes be mistaken in his facts and in his conclusions; but ~~that~~ could only be demonstrated by a scholar of equal or superior learning and patience in investigation. For a general assembly to undertake to sit in judgment on the results of such work is the height of absurdity, and would be very ridiculous if it were not fraught with such serious consequences.

By a large induction of facts from early Christian literature Professor McGiffert, in this volume, five-sixths of which consist of critical notes, shows that the Apostles' Creed was not a thing of instantaneous manufacture, but of historical growth; and from this point of view he interprets the meaning of its articles. According to his view the symbol originated at Rome, about the middle of the second century, as a protest against the Marcionitic heresy which was then disturbing the church in the capital city

of the empire. It must not be regarded as a general statement of the Christian faith; for it omits much that is essential to that faith, while it includes a few things that are not essential. It was originally based upon the baptismal formula and was intended to serve as a confession of faith in connection with the administration of baptism. The baptismal formula, however, was not originally a *trinitarian* formula. According to Professor McGiffert it ran as follows: "Into the name of God, and of Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit." From this formula it would not be easy to get the modern trinitarian doctrine of three coequal persons in the essence of the Godhead. And as the old baptismal formula is not, in the modern sense, trinitarian, so neither is the Creed.

From quotations in Irenæus, Tertullian, and other Christian writers in the second century Professor McGiffert reconstructs the original Roman Creed as follows: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus his Son, who was born of Mary the Virgin, was crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried, on the third day rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth on the right hand of the Father, from whence he cometh to judge quick and dead; and in Holy Spirit, resurrection of flesh." This was the Roman Creed as it stood about the middle of the second century. By the end of the fourth century, as we know from Rufinus who wrote an exposition of it, several additions had been made; for instance, the second article now read: "and in Christ Jesus His only begotten Son our Lord; who was born of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin." The last part at this time read thus: "and in Holy Spirit, holy church, remission of sins, resurrection of flesh." As it stood in the Church of Aquelia, to which Rufinus belonged, the Creed at this time also contained the article of *the descent into Hades*, but in the Roman church this was still wanting, as was also the article on *the communion of saints*. As to the subsequent development of the symbol we can afford space only to mention a few things. After the adoption of the Nicene Creed and its promulgation in the west, the old Roman Creed dropped out of use in the Roman Church. "In the eighth or ninth century, however, the old creed came into use again in connection with baptism and ultimately crowded out the Nicene Creed altogether." But by this time it had received still further additions, and had taken the form in which we now have it. These additions came partly from North Africa, but principally from Gaul, or at least from Western Europe, where it seems to have been in more general use than in Rome from the fourth century on to the eighth. Thus, in its completed form, the symbol came to Rome from Gaul; and Rome gave it to the Protestant church in modern times. Only one change has been made, and this occurred in the time of Henry VIII., in the accepted English form, namely, for "*resurrectio carnis*," we read "*resurrection of the body*"; which is more in

harmony with modern scientific thought, and also with the teaching of St. Paul in the New Testament.

A large part of the work before us is devoted to the interpretation of the Creed. This interpretation proceeds in the light of its origin and history; and as Professor McGiffert holds that its origin was conditioned mainly by the appearance at Rome of the heresy of Marcion, of course that heresy will largely condition its interpretation. It should be stated, however, that as to the relation of the Creed to Marcion Professor McGiffert confesses that he differs somewhat from other eminent students, especially Caspari and Kattenbusch, who claim for the Creed a more universal purpose and interest. We think, however, that one who follows Professor McGiffert in his examination of authorities and facts, will be inclined generally to accept his conclusions in preference to those of the men whom he criticises. But let us now present some specimens of his interpretation. The expression "Father Almighty" in the first article, for instance, is explained in the light of God's relation to the universe, and not in relation to Christ or the Trinity. The expression "means, not the father of Christ or of the Son, but the father of the world, or the universe, that is, its creator, author, or source." This may at first view be somewhat startling; but when the connection with *father* of the predicate *almighty*, *παντοκράτωρ*, the *all-ruler*, is born in mind, it will be felt that the reference of the term *father* to the creation is after all not unreasonable. And when the numerous quotations from the Christian literature of the time are allowed to have their weight, we think it will be generally felt that no other reference is possible. This is not true, however, as Professor McGiffert also admits of the somewhat later time of Irenæus and Tertullian, when the term *father* was used with special reference to the *son*, and when, at the expense of simplicity and plainness, the phrase "creator of heaven and earth" was added. The whole article is supposed to be a protest against Marcion's doctrine that the God of Christ was not the creator of the universe, who appears in the Old Testament. On the article concerning the Son of God Dr. McGiffert says: "It is evident that the article refers not to the pre-existent Son of God—the divine Logos, or the second person of the Trinity—but to the historic figure of Jesus. Divine sonship is asserted only of the historic person who was born of a virgin, was crucified, buried, and raised again from the dead. \* \* \* It does not exclude belief in such pre-existence, but on the other hand it does not assert it, nor even hint at it in the remotest way." In fact the idea of the virgin birth is rather unfavorable than favorable to the idea of pre-existence. Paul and John doubtless taught this doctrine, but the representation of Luke and Matthew is quite different. "What we have in Matthew and Luke," says Dr. McGiffert, "is not that the Holy Spirit (or the Logos) passes through the womb of Mary

and so becomes a man, but that the Holy Spirit joins with Mary in producing a new person, Jesus Christ. And so the belief in the virgin birth and the belief in the pre-existence and deity of Christ do not depend historically the one upon the other," p. 127. Dr. McGiffert calls attention to the fact that in the Creed the origin of Christ is described as *ex τῆς παρθένου*, not *διὰ τῆς παρθένου*. The latter form would evidently be the more consistent with the idea of pre-existence.

Passing over very much that is interesting in Dr. McGiffert's interpretation of the Creed in its successive forms, and that we would like to refer to if space permitted, we come to the article concerning the *church* and the *communion of saints*. According to the interpretation of the Reformers the phrase *communio sanctorum* is equivalent to *congregatio sanctorum*, *Gemeinde der Heiligen*. This explanation Dr. McGiffert contests, and suggests that, as the word *communio* is an abstract, it should be taken in the sense of *participation in*, or *fellowship with*. *Sanctorum* may be either masculine or neuter, and mean *persons* or *things*; but in its connection in the Creed most likely means *things*—the sacred things, the sacraments, etc., through which the forgiveness of sins is to be obtained. The predicate *Catholic* does not mean *universal*, in the sense that it is spread everywhere and is intended for every one. That, indeed, was the original meaning of the term, as it was used, for instance, for the first time, in Ignatius; but in course of time, when heresy sprang up, it was used to designate the orthodox church in distinction from the heretical communions; and that signification it had in the Creed down to the time of the Reformation. Consequently the modern usage, according to which the term designates the church universal in distinction from any divisions which may exist, is directly the opposite of its usage in the original Creed.

But we must desist from the further multiplication of examples of Professor McGiffert's interpretation. We commend this book to the careful perusal, or rather *study*, of our readers. They may be supposed to be interested in the understanding of the Creed, as the readers of this REVIEW were in years past. But such understanding can not be reached by *assumption*; on the contrary it can be reached only by careful and patient study of its origin and history. For such study we know of no better help than this work of McGiffert. It leads the reader to the sources, and enables him to form his own conclusions. There is no work accessible to the English reader that performs this service so well as this; and we would consider the general study of it by the ministers of the church not merely beneficial to themselves, but to the church as well. Just at this time when historians are studying the origins of Christianity with an acuteness and zeal never exhibited before, and when one long maintained prejudice after another is giving



way before the clearer light of modern science, such a work as this must be particularly valuable and helpful. The conscientious theologian and preacher wants to know the certainty of things wherein he has been instructed. For the decision of theological questions it is no longer sufficient to appeal to the "wonderful inner logic of the Creed"; on the contrary, before this creed can be of much service now, it must be understood in the light of its own origin and history; and such understanding is possible only on the basis of such study as Professor McGiffert has given to the subject.

THE TEMPLE BIBLE. *Exodus*, A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D., *Leviticus*, J. A. Paterson, D.D.; *Esra, Nehemiah, and Esther*, J. Wilson Harper, D.D.; *St. Matthew and St. Mark*, The Rev. Dean of Eli; *The Johannine Books*, Rev. Canon Benham, D.D. J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, Pa. 1902. Price 40 cents per volume.

These five volumes have been added to this series since the first volume was noticed in the January number of this REVIEW. For a general account of the plan and purpose of this work we refer to that notice. Each volume contains a general introduction to the book or books which it contains, treating of such matters as the authorship, contents, characteristics, scope, and style of the several books, and notes explanatory of geographical, ethnological, and textual difficulties. Each volume contains a *frontispiece* representing some famous painting. Maps, tables of synchronisms of ancient history, tables of Hebrew weights and measures, and tables of Biblical references in English literature are found at the end of each volume. The Biblical text adopted is that of the Authorized Version. The volumes are bound in limp cloth, which makes them easy to handle, and yet neat and artistic in appearance. The promise of the *prospectus* has thus far been fulfilled in these volumes, that the English Bible is to be given to the English public, "as literature pure and simple, free from doctrinal bias or denominational bent." What this conception of the Bible as literature means for the editors is well expressed in the first paragraph of the introduction to the volume on *Exodus*: "The aim of the 'Temple Bible' is to lead those who love their Bible to a more intelligent appreciation of its value as literature. This does not imply any want of respect for the sacred Scriptures as the unique record of God's revelation of Himself to the world and of His redemptive purpose for humanity. The heavenliness of the matter can not be impaired by a reverent study of the variety of literary form in which the matter is enshrined."

In any writing on the Pentateuch one is anxious, first of all, to know the position of the writer in regard to the authorship and historicity of the sacred books. And as might be anticipated in a work of this kind, the editors of *Exodus* and *Leviticus* stand in full

line with modern critical and historical scholars. "It will be our endeavor," says Dr. Kennedy, in the volume on Exodus, "in accordance with the avowed purpose of this series, to put the reader in possession of the latest *accepted* results of the best criticism." That result, as presented in this volume, is that the Pentateuch as we now have it, is a work of composite origin, containing at least four independent documents, though several of these themselves consist of a number of separate narratives, each document having been first written centuries after the time with which it professes to deal, the last of them dating from the time of the exile or shortly after it. In view of this fact it can not be surprising when we read that there are "sagas," "legends," etc., in Genesis and Exodus. As an illustration of the manner in which historical material is treated, we may refer to the case of the *tabernacle*. "If one thing is more certain than another," says Dr. Kennedy, "it is that the authors of those chapters (relating to this subject in Exodus) have given us their *ideal* not only of what was in the perfect Mosaic time, but of what they hoped might again be in the days to come. When we turn to our oldest historical witnesses both within and without the Pentateuch, we find that the ancient sanctuary of the ark was a simple tent—'the tent of meeting.' It was pitched by Moses 'without the camp' (Ex. 33: 7), and had as its guardians not an organized body of priests and Levites, but the young Ephraimite, Joshua, who slept within it, as Samuel slept in the later sanctuary at Shilo." Another illustration is presented in the case of the *priesthood*. According to Dr. Paterson, in the introduction of Leviticus, there was in the earliest times, the times represented by the combined documents, *i. e.*, in the Pentateuch, no legally recognized priesthood at all; in the time of Deuteronomy all Levites were priests; while the so-called Aaronic priesthood only dates from the time of Ezechiel.

These views, with their implications for the history of Israel, are presented now as no longer needing any apology or defence. They are "the latest *accepted* results of the best criticism"—the almost universally accepted results of scholarly critics and intelligent Bible students. Professor Sayce, the editor of the volume on Genesis, indeed, differs, as we remember, with the almost unanimous conclusions of other critics; but, then, he is as far from agreeing with the traditionalists as he is from agreeing with the critics. In fact he is a critic himself, and forms a class of his own, who can not be counted at all in the ultimate summing up of results. The critical theory has been so universally accepted by competent and unprejudiced scholars that no one now needs to offer any apology for avowing disbelief of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch or of the historicity of all the statements contained in all the Biblical books. This does not mean, however,

that the Bible generally is to be regarded as unhistorical or untrustworthy. It means, however, that we must not apply the standards of modern historiography to the historical books of the Bible. "To two things," says Dr. Harper, in the introduction to Ezra, Nehemia, and Esther, "very great prominence should here be given. *First*, that the Books themselves make no claim as to authorship; and, second, that modern historical standards can not be applied to ancient methods of writing history. Writers of antiquity took over documents which served their purposes, without hesitation, and without acknowledgment. Redactors did not scruple to make emendations, or to bring the history up to their own time." This means that historical accuracy was not a particular object of these writers. Their end was mainly a religious one. They wrote not so much for the purpose of instructing their readers as to the facts of history, but rather for the purpose of instructing or edifying them in the truths of religion; and for this latter purpose legends and sagas would answer as well as would hard historical facts. Nevertheless Dr. Harper holds that the main contents of the books which he edits are historical. Even the story of Esther, he thinks, may rest upon a historical foundation, because it is true to the character of Xerxes as it is otherwise known to us; though in the notes he himself records the facts which make belief in the story impossible.

In the introduction to the volume on Matthew and Mark the Dean of Eli discusses briefly but luminously Christ's conception of the kingdom of heaven, Christ's idea of God, Christ's idea of man, and Christ's method of ethics. In the discussion of these topics there come to view the modern conceptions of the kingdom as the highest good, of the universal fatherhood of God and the universal sonship of men, and of the inwardness and spirituality of ethics. On the lawfulness of historical criticism, the Dean says: "Certainly there will be no fear of historical criticism when once it is realized that the critic is called by God to be a critic, and that criticism itself is a part of that divine purpose by which God is, on the one hand, emancipating His word from the human opinions of the Past; and, on the other, upholding in His church new ideals of life and knowledge for the Present." An interesting discussion of the "Synoptic Problem" also forms a part of this introduction; but we can not give any particular account of it here. In fifty-three pages Canon Benham discusses the authenticity and character of the Johannine writings. He defends the old view that all these writings are genuine productions of the pen of St. John, the Apostle. The order of their composition he believes to have been as follows: (1) The Apocalypse, in the time of Claudius; (2) The Gospel; and, (3) The Epistles. In regard to this question the cautious critic will probably be inclined to suspend judgment. This, however, does not lower the value of this

introduction, in which some of the leading conceptions of the Johannine theology are discussed. On the question as to the *Preterist* or *Futurist* interpretation of the Apocalypse, Dr. Benham says: "The book is not a book of puzzles and conundrums, which we, in this twentieth century, are to weary ourselves in solving. It had a meaning for that time (in which it was written), and the more we see what that meaning was, the clearer might any century, from then till now, view its own doings in the light of God."

*The Temple Bible* is not intended especially for professional theologians, but for intelligent Christians generally. It, accordingly, gives the results without the processes and apparatus of modern scientific Bible study, and in this way makes it possible for plain Christian men and women to know what the Bible really is according to the judgment of the best modern scholarship. Ministers of the gospel who desire that their people should have in their hands a Bible which they, with their *present light*, can conscientiously preach, will, therefore, we believe, be glad to recommend the volumes of this series. They will show them how the modern ideas of evolution, higher criticism, etc., can be adopted without any loss of faith in the religious teaching of the Bible. And these volumes can be recommended also on the score of economy; for the people here get a Bible that can be read with ease and comfort, for about half the price which they would have to pay for one of the large, heavy, unwieldy, gilded volumes which are intended only for parlor display. The whole number of volumes will be *twenty-four*, and the price per volume *forty cents*.

*Aus dem Leben einer Evangelischen Gemeinde.* Von Dr. Hermann Dalton. Pages xv + 325. C. Bertelsmann, Güttersloh. Price 3.60 M., unbound. 1901.

Dr. Dalton was for many years pastor of a German Reformed congregation in St. Petersburg, Russia; and in the publication before us we have life-pictures of that congregation. The congregation is a large and interesting one, and has behind it a history of more than 150 years. It is composed mainly of German residents in the capital of Russia. The number of members in 1886 was 3,091. Dr. Dalton's pastorate of this congregation lasted for more than forty years; and naturally he has very many things to tell, which should be of interest and profit to those who are partakers of the "same excellent ministry" with himself, to whom the book is dedicated, as well as to earnest and intelligent Christians generally. In fact both classes will find it to be a treatise on *practical theology* of no small value. It contains the experiences, the methods and plans, the failures and successes, and the confession of faith, of a man who spent a long life in the Christian ministry, and proved himself to be a workman that needeth not to

be ashamed in circumstances that were often trying in the extreme. In fact one who reads these pages, and learns of the author's fidelity and devotion to his work, and of his resourceful fertility in practical plans and methods in the management of so large a congregation, can not help coming to the conclusion that here is a man who has not only enjoyed in a high degree the divine blessing upon his work, but one who is a genius of the highest order in the practice of the Christian ministry. Such a man must have many things to say to his fellow ministers of the gospel that shall be instructive and encouraging to them; and it was well, therefore, that at the request of a dear friend, he has written and given to the public this book so full of pictures from the life of himself and of the church he so long and faithfully served.

As an index to what the reader may expect to find in this book we here insert the *table of contents*: I. *The Congregation*. II. *The Church Council*. III. *The Pastor*. IV. *The Diaconate*. V. *The Church-Building*. VI. *Divine Service*. VII. *Childrens' Service and the Sunday-school*. VIII. *Holy Baptism*. IX. *Instruction of Catechumens*. X. *Confirmation*. XI. *The Holy Communion*. XII. *The Marriage Service*. XIII. *The Burial of the Dead*. XIV. *The Parochial School*. From this index of subjects it will be observed that the work treats of about everything that concerns a pastor and congregation. And the fact that the congregation whose picture is here given does not belong to any state church, but is an independent and self-supporting congregation in a foreign city, lends additional interest to the work for an American reader. With many things which are here noticed the pastor of a state church has nothing to do, but they are matters of vital importance to American pastors of all denominations, and especially to those of our own Reformed Church. Among these are questions, for instance, relating to the constitution of the church council, the election of elders and deacons, and their duties, the management of the finances of the congregation, the removal of church debts, etc. What is the relation of the pastor to the finances of a congregation, and in general to the raising of money for congregational purposes? Should the pastor take these matters directly into his own hands, and manage them as he manages the conduct of worship, or the instruction of catechumens? Dr. Dalton says, No, for this would be to forsake the ministry of the word, and to serve tables. It is the pastor's duty, indeed, to be interested in all that concerns the existence and welfare of the congregation over which he is called to preside, and therefore also in its financial condition. It is his duty to keep alive in the hearts of his parishioners the feeling of divine charity and the spirit of beneficence, and to teach them the blessedness of giving of their substance for the support of the various benevolent enterprises of the church. But he himself should not be the solicitor or collector of money.

The members of the church should be protected against the thought that the pastor's visits have anything to do with his or the congregation's purse. When money is to be raised for a church building fund, or for any other worthy purpose, the pastor should stir up the spirit of beneficence in the hearts of the people, but the work of soliciting funds should be left to the proper officers of the church. We believe that that is right, on principle, and, in a large congregation like that which Dr. Dalton served, no other course should be thought of; but in our small American congregations circumstances sometimes arise which seem to make an opposite course necessary.

We have been interested especially in what Dr. Dalton says of the pastor in his capacity of *preacher*, and of the preparation of sermons. The Christian minister is first and foremost a preacher of the word. To be a *preacher of the gospel* he is called, not to be a *pulpit orator*. Not fine discourses, not finished orations, will build up a congregation in faith and piety, but only the faithful preaching of the gospel. In preaching Dr. Dalton recommends a return to the primitive form of the *homily*, in which the preacher speaks as a brother directly to Christian brethren, and which consists mainly in the interpretation and application of sacred Scripture. He favors *textual* and scriptural, rather than *thematic* preaching, in which the preacher is tempted too much to break away from the text, and discourse on all sorts of themes independently of Scripture. We believe that this is in the main a correct position; as it has also been, for the most part, the historical position of the Reformed Church. But this method, too, has its perils. One of these is that the sermon tends too easily to the form of a mere *exegetical lecture*; and another is that a sermon of this kind is apt to lose that *unity* which is required in order to make a spiritual discourse really effective for some definite purpose. A textual sermon must be well and carefully prepared, it must possess the quality of unity, and it must combine application with interpretation at every point, in order that it may be really a good sermon. This seems to have been the kind of sermons that Dr. Dalton habitually preached; and of its effectiveness for his congregation these pages afford abundant evidence. He never entered his pulpit without the most thorough preparation. Brooding over his text for a number of days, the sermon usually was fully wrought out by Saturday noon, but it was not committed to writing until Sunday morning. Dr. Dalton was in the habit of rising early on Sunday morning, and writing out his sermon while the members of his congregation were for the most still sleeping. The manuscript, however, was never taken into the pulpit. The delivery of the sermon was always free. This was doubtless a good plan for Dr. Dalton. Would it be a good plan for every preacher? Would not the nervous strain in which a man



would pass Saturday night tend to keep him awake, and thus unfit him for his work in the morning? We know it would be so in the case of the present writer. And in fact every preacher must find out for himself what is for him the best method of preaching; but no one may perform the function of preaching in a careless or perfunctory way.

Another matter in which we have been much interested is the account given in this book of the *order of worship* adopted and followed by Dr. Dalton's congregation. It was a unique congregation. It was, and is still, a Reformed congregation, for its confessional book is the Heidelberg Catechism. Its membership had come from many parts of the German fatherland. This made it inexpedient to adopt any one of the liturgies in use in different parts of Germany; although the author expresses an affection for the "*neue Agende der preussischen Landeskirche*." The *order of worship*, as also the hymn book, was therefore especially composed for the use of this congregation, although it contained prayers for festival days as well as for ordinary Sundays derived from some one of the German liturgies in use in various parts of the fatherland; so that the liturgy as well as the congregation was quite a composite one. It was quite simple, Dr. Dalton tells, wholly unlike the luxuriously ornate order of the established state church. As he describes it, however, it would, a few decades ago, at least, have been regarded by our Puritans as the very abomination of ritualism itself. Of course, Dr. Dalton, like German theologians and ministers generally, is of no such narrow mind. He can appreciate the beauty and the impressiveness of a genuine liturgy. As showing his mind on this subject we here translate a few sentences from page 140 of this volume: "The so-called liturgical side of worship has been very poorly developed among us, consisting only of meagre remains, not from the days of the Reformation, in which both sister churches, the Reformed as well as the Lutheran, had given to their worship a more richly liturgical form, but rather from a much later time, in which the prevailing tendency of the day, boasting of its illumination, penetrated also into the evangelical orders of worship, and in sermon, hymn, and prayer, brutally swept away whatever did not please it. That time has passed away like a flood; its waters have disappeared. But in all evangelical churches the attempt has not yet been made to transform the meagre liturgical structures of that wretched time into something better." It is thus that Dr. Dalton writes on this subject. And yet Dr. Dalton could not be accused of being a Romanist, and of seeking deliverance from other ills in a "grand liturgy." He is Reformed, and takes pleasure in the grand simplicity of the Reformed Church; although that simplicity includes altar, organ, fixed prayers, church festivals, and various other things which on this side of the ocean have been denounced as ugly spots in the fair garments of a pure church.

Dr. Dalton's *order of worship* embraced a system of Scripture lessons to be read in the public service of the church, which, however, was changed from year to year. He was, as he tells us, unable to endure the "tyranny of the pericopal system," that is, the system of Gospel and Epistle lessons appointed by the church to be read and preached on every Sunday regularly throughout the year. The system of pericopes now in use in some Protestant churches, like the Lutheran, Episcopal, and to some extent our own, has been derived substantially from the Catholic Church of the middle ages. It has, of course, been considerably modified and changed; but it still has defects. Dr. Dalton claims that in many parts it still bears an "offensively Romish stamp." For this reason, and also for the reason that the constant repetition of it would tend to restrict a congregation's knowledge of the Bible to a very small part of its contents, Dr. Dalton would not use it. But he could not be satisfied either to depend upon the haphazard selection of lesson and text from Sunday to Sunday. He, therefore, at the beginning of each year, made selections for the whole year, and published them with the order of worship. The Scripture readings and the texts of sermons were thus fixed in advance for the whole year, and the order thus laid down was never departed from. The hymns to be used each Sunday were thus selected and published likewise. The labor required for this work consumed several weeks at the beginning of each year; but Dr. Dalton thinks that it was after all a saving of time, besides giving to the congregation variety and freshness in its services, and an extended knowledge of the Bible. Here is a hint of no small importance to practical preachers. There is always an advantage in a fixed programme for a longer or shorter period of time; and if it can be in the hands of the congregation for some time in advance, so much the better. These are a few of the points of interest in this book of Dr. Dalton's. There are many others of equal importance. We sincerely recommend the work to those of our readers who are familiar with the German language. Some may not agree at all points with the underlying theology, but we are sure that all will be benefited by a perusal of the book.